



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-149
Friday
2 August 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-149

CONTENTS

2 August 1991

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Assessments of START Treaty Reported	1
Yazov on Treaty Provisions [IZVESTIYA 2 Aug]	1
Lebedev Explains Provisions [TRUD 27 Jul]	3
Movement Welcomes Treaty Signing [INTERFAX]	4
TASS Views Treaty	4
Officials on Geneva-2 Talks on Weapons Reductions [INTERFAX]	5
Preparations for CFE Implementation Under Way [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jul]	5

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

World Economic Forum To Be Held in Moscow [ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 31 Jul]	7
Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gives Briefing 1 Aug	7
Support for Nuclear-Free Zone Announced [TASS]	7
Fishermen's Plight in Nigeria Viewed [TASS]	7
Swedish Test Ban Proposal Hailed [TASS]	7
Great Belt Bridge Discussed [TASS]	8
TASS Summarizes Briefing	8
UN Official Presents Chernobyl Conference Report [TASS]	8

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Bush-Gorbachev Summit	10
Preview of Meeting [KOMSOLOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Jul]	10
Gorbachev Speaks at Bush Dinner [TASS]	11
Bush Gives Dinner for Gorbachev [TASS]	11
Further on Press Conference [PRAVDA 1 Aug]	11
Bush Speech to Businessmen Noted [PRAVDA 1 Aug]	16
Commentator Reviews Summit Impact [Moscow TV]	18
Soviet, U.S. Researchers Study Ozone Layer [TASS]	18

Northeast Asia

Three Japanese Boats Violate Sea Border [INTERFAX]	19
Fourth Schooner Confiscated [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jul]	19
USSR Is 'Rightful Owner' of Kurils [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jul]	19
Silayev To Visit Japan 17-24 Aug [INTERFAX]	19
Moscow-DPRK Economic Cooperation Discussed [Moscow International]	20
DPRK Relations Experience Transition [Moscow International]	20
Politician Speaks at Diplomatic Academy [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 25 Jul]	21

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentary Views New ASEAN Objectives [PRAVDA 27 Jul]	21
Rogachev Optimistic on Cambodian Settlement [TASS]	22

Near East & South Asia

Bush Calls on Israel, Palestinians To Negotiate	[IZVESTIYA 27 Jul]	23
Interview With Belonogov on Gulf Crisis Results	[INTERFAX]	23
Dalai Lama Leaves Moscow for New Delhi	[TASS]	24
Commentary Views Talks on Afghan Problem	[Moscow International]	24
Naval Squadron Visits Syria	[TASS]	25

East Europe

Yugoslavia's Markovic Arrives in Moscow for Visit		25
Commentary Examines Visit	[TASS]	25
Arrival Noted	[TASS]	26
Meets With Gorbachev	[TANJUG]	26
Meets With Pavlov	[PRAVDA 2 Aug]	26
Further on Pavlov Talks	[TASS]	27
Meets Yeltsin	[Radio Rossi]	27
Discusses Direct Accords	[Moscow Russian TV]	27
Views SFRY With Yeltsin	[TANJUG]	28
Yeltsin Comments	[INTERFAX]	28
Report on Support of Yugoslav Unity	[INTERFAX]	28
Lithuanian Recognition Said Invalid	[TASS]	29
Bulgarian Assembly Urges New USSR Treaty	[TASS]	29
News Conference on Bulgarian Nuclear Station	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jul]	29
Claim of Romania to Ukraine Criticized	[INTERFAX]	30
Commentary on Romanian-Italian Treaty	[IZVESTIYA 26 Jul]	30

West Europe

Britain's Lamont Continues Visit		30
Meets With Gorbachev	[PRAVDA 2 Aug]	30
Discusses Economy	[TASS]	31
Visits Goods Exchange	[TASS]	31
Comparison of TASS Interview		31
Turkish Army Chief Visits Transcaucasus	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jul]	32

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Committee Proceedings Reported	[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 26 Jul]	33
Agrarian Policy Commission Proceedings Reported	[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 26 Jul]	34

Political & Social

Gorbachev Gives Compensation to Three Republics	[Moscow Radio]	35
Gorbachev Presents Awards to ZIL Workers	[TASS]	35
Arbatov Discusses Future of USSR	[Moscow International]	35
Gavril Popov on Prospect of CPSU Split	[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 25 Jul]	35
On Need for New Party	[ARGUMENT I FAKTY No 29]	37
Laptev Says Gorbachev 'Moving Forward'	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Jul]	39
Yeltsin Decree's Effect on Gorbachev Viewed	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 31 Jul]	40
Shevardnadze Interviewed on Baltics, Army Control	[London TV]	40
Democratic Reform Leaders Welcome Yeltsin Decree	[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 31 Jul]	41
Government Orders Halt to Privatization of Dachas	[TASS]	42
Cabinet on Air Traffic Controllers' Problems	[Moscow International]	42
Commentator on Implications of Draft Program	[IZVESTIYA 30 Jul]	42
Plenum Attendees Criticize Draft Program	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jul]	43
Prohibitive Cost of Foreign Travel Deplored	[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 1 Aug]	44
TASS Reviews 2 Aug Soviet Central Press		44

Economic

CPSU Commission Discusses Conversion [PRAVDA 25 Jul]	45
More on Cabinet Decisions on Economic Matters [IZVESTIYA 26 Jul]	46
Defense Industry Official on Conversion Process [Moscow International]	46
Thefts From Railroad Pose Mounting Problem [Moscow TV]	46

Agriculture

Deputy Premier Senko Views Agro-Industry Tasks [IZVESTIYA 17 Jul]	47
Saratov Heatwave Hits Grain Yields [ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 27 Jul]	49

Military

CPSU Commissions Discuss Military Issues [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jul]	50
Fleet Admiral Makarov Navy Day 1991 Interview [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Jul]	50

BALTIC REPUBLICS

Estonia

Republic Leaders Express Condolences on Tragedy [BALTFAX]	53
---	----

Latvia

Gorbunovs Sends Condolences on Border Attack [Riga International]	53
Republic Procurator Justifies Border Post Attacks [Riga International]	53
'Special Tasks Unit' Fighting Street Crime [Riga International]	53
Baltic Officials Receive U.S. Delegation [Riga International]	53
Latvia, Poland To Sign Interstate Treaty [BALTFAX]	53
Latvia, Czechoslovakia To Sign Economic Treaty [BALTFAX]	54

Lithuania

Further Details of Medininkai Killings Given [BALTFAX]	54
Probe Into Murders Continues [BALTFAX]	54
Landsbergis Addresses Supreme Council [Radio Vilnius]	55
Supreme Council Debates Incident [Moscow Russian TV]	55
Further on Supreme Council Session [Radio Vilnius]	56
Parliament Discusses Tragedy [BALTFAX]	56
Republic MVD Reinforced for Investigation [TASS]	56
Interior Ministry Official on Events [Moscow Radio]	57
MVD Official on Killings Investigation [Moscow TV]	57
Correspondent on 'Political' Killings [Moscow Radio]	58
Demonstrators Blame Communists [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Aug]	58
IZVESTIYA on Aftermath of Killings [2 Aug]	59
Center Branded Responsible [ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 2 Aug]	59
Interior Ministry Appeal on Deaths [Radio Vilnius]	60
Mobile Armed Units To Protect Posts [Radio Vilnius]	60
U.S. Urged To Probe Deaths [BALTFAX]	60
Party Issues Statement on Attack [TASS]	61
Night Passes 'Without Incidents' [TASS]	61
Acting Minister of Internal Affairs Resigns [BALTFAX]	61

RSFSR

Union Treaty Signing To Begin 20 Aug [INTERFAX]	62
Yeltsin, Landsbergis on Significance of Treaty [ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 30 Jul]	62
Report on Yeltsin-Bush Meeting in Moscow [Radio Rossii]	62
Prokofyev Discusses CPSU, Yeltsin [Budapest Radio]	63
Khasbulatov Interviewed on Changes in RSFSR [Moscow Russian TV]	64

Decree Announces Ministerial Appointments [ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 31 Jul]	65
Yakovlev Named Moscow Public Assembly Chairman [TASS]	65
Moscow City Council Chairman Views Privatization [INTERFAX]	65
Murmansk Obkom Plans 'Underground Work' [IZVESTIYA 27 Jul]	66
Leningrad Council Drafts Sovereignty Project [INTERFAX]	66

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Ukraine

President Bush Pays Visit to Ukraine 1 Aug	67
Bush Arrives in Kiev [TASS]	67
Kravchuk Welcomes Bush at Airport [Kiev Radio]	67
Official Talks Held [TASS]	68
Expanded Talks Noted [Moscow Radio]	68
Bush Introduced at Supreme Soviet [Kiev Radio]	68
Bush's Speech Summarized [Moscow Radio]	68
Kravchuk Thanks Bush for Speech [Kiev Radio]	69
Bush Tours Kiev [TASS]	69
Remarks at Babi Yar Memorial Cited [TASS]	70
Party Prepares Letter for Bush [Kiev Radio]	70
Bush Departs Kiev [TASS]	70
Kravchuk Calls Visit 'Fruitful' [TASS]	70
Preview Discusses Impact of Bush Visit [Kiev International]	70

CAUCASUS

Georgia

Foreign Minister Khoshtaria on Independence [INTERFAX]	72
Premier Supports Kazakhstan Initiative [INTERFAX]	72
Paper on Charges Military Provoked Incidents [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jul]	72
Turks in Georgia Demonstrate Over Homeland Issue [Moscow Russian TV]	72

Armenia

'Revival' of Terrorist Organization Noted [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jul]	73
National-Democratic Alliance Formed [TASS]	73

Azerbaijan

Official Views Visit by Russian Deputies [INTERFAX]	73
Two Farmers Killed in Nagorno-Karabakh [TASS]	74
Terrorist Group Suspected in Train Blast [TASS]	74
Mutalibov Says World Misunderstands Republic [TASS]	74
Interior Minister Refutes False Information [TASS]	75

Assessments of START Treaty Reported

Yazov on Treaty Provisions

PM0108180591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Aug 91 Union Edition p 2

[Interview with USSR Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov by correspondent V. Litovkin; place and date not given; first part is IZVESTIYA INTRODUCTION: "Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov: It is a Balanced Treaty"]

[Text] On 31 July the USSR and U.S. Presidents signed a Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms. Our military correspondent V. Litovkin talked with USSR Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov.

[Litovkin] Dmitriy Timofeyevich, the signed treaty contains more than 800 pages of closely written text. Analyzing it is difficult. The political significance of the document is well known. What about its purely military aspect?

[Yazov] It is difficult to separate the treaty's military aspect from its political significance. It makes it possible to lower the level of nuclear confrontation between the USSR and the United States, strengthen strategic stability, and thereby reduce the likelihood of a nuclear conflict. Moreover, the treaty affects all components of strategic offensive arms: land-based ICBM's, submarine-launched ballistic missiles [SLBM's] and strategic aviation ballistic missiles including air-launched cruise missiles [ALCM's], and other nuclear arms. It is a treaty that for the first time ever not only limits, but reduces strategic nuclear arms.

I will give some specific figures. The total number of deployed land-based ICBM's, SLBM's, and heavy bombers is to be reduced to the level of 1,600 units and the number of weapons to 6,000. According to the official data we exchanged, the USSR currently has 2,500 nuclear weapon delivery vehicles and 10,271 weapons for them. The United States has 2,222 vehicles and 10,371 weapons respectively.

We are reducing the total number of vehicles by 900 units, which is 36 percent, including 154 heavy ICBM's—only we have them—which is 50 percent. The United States will reduce the number of vehicles by 622 units, or 28 percent. The total number of weapons on both sides, according to the agreed counting rules, will be reduced by 4,271 (USSR) and 4,371 (United States) weapons respectively, by 42 percent in all.

The actual number of ballistic missiles and heavy bombers to be cut and taken out of service will depend on the structure and composition of the strategic nuclear forces the sides consider they will need by the end of the reductions within the framework of the agreed levels. The Soviet Union's preliminary intention is to reduce in the context of its strategic nuclear forces the number of

ICBM's by approximately 400 missiles (30 percent) and the number of SLBM's by approximately 500 missiles (50 percent). There will be practically no reduction of heavy bombers in the Soviet Union.

I will provide the following table as a demonstration for your readers.

USSR	Initial Figures	Approximate Number of Strategic Offensive Weapons Being Reduced to Levels of 1,600 Delivery Vehicles and 6,000 Weapons
ICBM's	1,398	approximately 400 (30 percent)
SLBM's	940	approximately 500 (50 percent)
Heavy Bombers	162	—
Total	2,500	900 (36 percent)
Weapons	10,271	4,271 (approx. 42 percent)
United States		
ICBM's	1,000	approximately 250 (25 percent)
SLBM's	648	approximately 200 (30 percent)
Heavy Bombers	574	approximately 200 (35 percent)
Total	2,222	622 (28 percent)
Weapons	10,371	4,371 (42 percent)

The total throw-weight of the ICBM's and SLBM's deployed by both sides as a result of the reduction will not exceed the level of approximately 50 percent of the existing level of the total throw-weight of the Soviet Union's deployed ICBM's and SLBM's.

Existing types of heavy ICBM's which are being quantitatively limited can be modernized within agreed criteria. But the creation [sozdaniye], production, and deployment of new types of heavy missiles is prohibited.

Heavy bombers equipped with nuclear arms will count as one vehicle toward the maximum level of 1,600 units. Those that are equipped with nuclear bombs and air-to-surface missiles with a range of up to 600 km will count as one weapon, which will be included in the maximum of 6,000. U.S. heavy bombers equipped for long-range (over 600 km) ALCM's will count as 10 weapons. The similar USSR bombers will count as eight.

Sea-launched cruise missiles [SLCM's] will not be limited by the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Arms. They are limited by the sides' politically binding statements relating to deployed long-range nuclear SLCM's. The number of these deployed SLCM's on each side should not exceed 880 for the duration of the treaty.

The reduction of ICBM's, SLBM's, and heavy bombers and their armaments will be carried out over a period of seven years in three stages (lasting three, two, and two years). We will reach this goal by reequipping or eliminating strategic offensive armaments in accordance with agreed procedures. ICBM's and SLBM's will be able to be used to launch objects into the upper layers of the atmosphere or into outer space.

The treaty will remain in force for 15 years and can be extended for further five-year periods unless it is replaced by a subsequent agreement before its term is up.

[Litovkin] What have we and the Americans gained from this treaty?

[Yazov] I would single out a few fundamental points. Our partners agreed with our demand for the 1972 ABM Treaty to be observed because a profound reduction of strategic offensive arms is impossible without a ban on the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of wide-ranging ABM defense.

Secondly, we secured a restriction on the flight range of ALCM's. This has been fixed at 600 km. Why 600? There are many reasons for this: The main reason being our anti-aircraft defense capabilities. A longer range would enable the United States, for instance, to equip its tactical aviation strike aircraft with these missiles, allowing them to carry out attacks without coming within range of our anti-aircraft defenses.

The restrictions on SLCM's are very important (they have a range of up to 2,600 km and fly at an altitude of 50 meters). Combating these missiles is a difficult task. They pose a serious threat. And the United States has a great advantage as regards these missiles.

We agreed that we would settle the question of SLCM's outside the Strategic Offensive Arms Treaty. The number of these missiles has been reduced to 880 units. Their range has also been fixed at 600 km.

Needless to say, it was difficult to reach agreement on this. The sides had to make certain compromises. Thus, the U.S. side pressed for a total ban on the production, all launches, and modernization of our heavy ICBM's. But then we would be left with no chance of counteraction in the event of the United States' deploying wide-ranging ABM defense.

We agreed to cut our heavy ICBM's, as you already know, by 50 percent. We will not create [ne budem sozdavat], test, or deploy new types of these missiles, but we are entitled to modernize them.

We are keeping our mobile ICBM's. At the same time we agreed to cut back roughly 50 percent of the total throw-weight of our ICBM's and SLBM's and agreed to count each heavy bomber with low-yield nuclear armaments and nuclear bombs as one carrier and one weapon.

There are other conditions too. I want to stress the main point. The Strategic Offensive Arms Treaty is an adequately well-balanced, well-considered document ensuring the sides' equality and identical security.

[Litovkin] Why did the sides only agree to a 40 percent cut in their strategic offensive arms—a 50 percent cut was planned, after all?

[Yazov] The point is that the preliminary accord in 1987 concerned the number of remaining nuclear munitions

and carriers. It was thought that the number of carriers in 1991 would be greater than it is. But life and the real situation have made changes. There is nothing surprising in that. I think that a 40 percent reduction in nuclear weapons represents a tremendous success for both sides.

[Litovkin] What guarantees are there that the treaty will be carried out?

[Yazov] The guarantees are our experience of implementing the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles and strict verification, including use of national equipment and facilities, on-site inspections, data exchange, and a system of notification, along with an end to the restrictions on access to telemetric information transmitted by ICBM's and SLBM's when launched.

Verification makes provision for permanent stays [pos-toyannoye prebyvaniye] by inspection groups at mobile missile production sites, trips to deployment areas, and a number of other conditions that will enable us to keep trusting one another.

[Litovkin] So, the Strategic Offensive Arms Treaty has been signed. What next?

[Yazov] I think that the next stage in ensuring international security could be to reach a qualitatively new level of cooperation between the USSR, the United States, and other states. First, political structures must do their work. I would single out two main areas here: the European-U.S., and the global areas. The state of affairs as regards the former is the most productive. It could be possible to outline the aim of moving on from separate major agreements to setting up an effective system of mutual security or permanent European security structures.

There could specifically be talk of setting up a permanent organ (a kind of European Security Council) vested with extensive powers—possibly based on the Conflict Prevention Center—"coalescing" existing military structures. In the course of this process there could be further strategic offensive arms cuts, restrictions on nuclear tests, and an agreement on further cuts in conventional armed forces (Vienna-2) and reductions in tactical nuclear weapons. Naval forces must also be included in the disarmament process.

The second area involves resolving major global questions, above all through relations with developing countries. It could consist of maintaining stability there, averting and settling regional conflicts, preventing the proliferation of nuclear and other mass-destruction weapons, along with missiles and missile technology, and reducing the trade in combat hardware and arms.

There are many prospects. But first it is important to carry out precisely and thoroughly the pledges that have been made. Peoples' hopes of a secure world must not be disappointed.

Lebedev Explains Provisions

91WC1040B Moscow TRUD in Russian 27 Jul 91 p 3

[Interview with Major General Yuriy Lebedev, Soviet military expert, by E. Alekseyev and Yu. Dmitriyev; place and date not given: "A Terrible Weapon Loses Weight: What the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty Provides For"]

[Text] It is the general opinion that the culmination of the present meeting between the presidents of the USSR and the United States will be the signing of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty [START]. This ceremonial act will draw the line under the nine-year marathon of discussions, doubts, heated arguments, and difficult compromise. It has taken nine long years to reach agreement on the initial stage of a reduction in the level of the strategic nuclear missile confrontation between our two countries. But how, and by how much? This is the subject of an interview with Soviet military expert Major General Yuriy Lebedev.

[TRUD] Let us begin with what is, in our opinion, the main thing, namely, under the treaty, how realistically will the most terrible and powerful of weapons—the strategic offensive arms—be reduced?

[Lebedev] First of all it is necessary to emphasize that the treaty covers all the main components of strategic offensive arms, namely, ground-launched intercontinental ballistic missiles [GLBM's], submarine-launched ballistic missiles [SLBM's], and heavy bombers. This will be the largest treaty ever drawn up in history. What is important about it is that it not only limits strategic arms but also really reduces them.

And now, what are called the basic parameters of the treaty. Here we must quote many figures, but they are the essence of the treaty.

Thus, under the terms of the treaty, each of the sides will reduce the total number of GLBM, SLBM, and heavy bomber delivery systems deployed to a level of 1,600. Within the limits of this number of weapons, the number of heavy GLBM's deployed, which only the USSR has, will be reduced to 154.

With respect to weapons [boyezaryady] deployed on GLBM's, SLBM's, and heavy bombers, each side will reduce these to 6,000. No more than 4,900 should be deployed on GLBM's and SLBM's, no more than 1,540 on heavy bombers, and no more than 1,100 weapons on mobile GLBM's.

[TRUD] You have cited the maximum number of weapons reduced under the treaty. But how do they correspond to the numbers of weapons [zaryady] in existence?

[Lebedev] It will not be a mistake to assert that during the course of the implementation of the treaty the weapons on strategic delivery systems will be approximately halved. But for the delivery systems the reductions will be less than 40 percent for the USSR and about 30 percent for the United States.

The treaty also provides for reductions in the total throw-weight carried by the GLBM's and SLBM's deployed by the sides. After these reductions the throw-weight will not exceed a level that is approximately 50 percent of that existing in the Soviet Union.

And yet one more detail should be noted, namely, that heavy GLBM's of the existing types subject to limitations with respect to numbers can be modernized within the framework of agreed criteria. However, new types of heavy GLBM's are banned.

Heavy bombers that can be armed with nuclear weapons will count as one delivery system within the 1,600 level. Heavy bombers equipped for nuclear bombs and air-to-ground missiles with a range of up to 600 kilometers will count as one weapon. They, too, will be counted as part of the 6,000 level. Heavy U.S. bombers equipped for nuclear air-launched cruise missiles [ALCM's] with a range of more than 600 kilometers will count as 10 weapons. Similar USSR heavy bombers will count as eight. Within the limit of 1,600 delivery systems the United States may have no more than 150 heavy bombers armed with nuclear ALCM's, which are counted as 10 weapons, while the USSR may have no more than 180 of these bombers.

It is planned to implement the quantitative limitations set by the treaty by re-equipping or eliminating strategic offensive arms in three stages in accordance with agreed procedures over seven years.

[TRUD] Has the question of sea-launched cruise missiles [SLCM's] been resolved or set aside?

[Lebedev] Long-range SLCM's, that is, those with a range of more than 600 kilometers, are not directly covered by the START treaty. However, with respect to these missiles the sides are issuing a politically binding statement. The number of such SLCM's deployed will not exceed 880 for each of the sides while the treaty is in force.

[TRUD] How will treaty compliance be monitored?

[Lebedev] For the entire period that the START treaty is in force there will be what I would say is an unprecedented regime of monitoring of compliance. It will include the use of national technical means, various categories of on-site inspections, the exchange of data and a system of mutual notification, and a ban on hampering access to telemetry information transmitted from aboard ballistic missiles during launches. So it is a broad and reliable system.

[TRUD] It is pleasing to be able to state that every detail of the treaty has been worked out and agreed upon. But surely everything was not quite so simple, was it? On what in particular did the two sides "stumble"?

[Lebedev] The process of the negotiations for the START treaty was complex in nature and demanded certain compromises from both sides, particularly on the most difficult questions. And there were many such questions.

I believe it is worthwhile to single out the problem of the interconnection between the new treaty and the 1972 ABM Treaty. On this issue the USSR and the United States had taken diametrically opposed positions. The Soviet side proceeded from the premise of the need to preserve the ABM Treaty as a defining condition for the stability of the strategic situation. The United States brought things to an undermining position of that treaty by retaining for itself the possibility of deploying an "effective strategic defense" within the framework of SDI.

In order to extricate ourselves from this impasse the Soviet side said that it would be possible to sign a START treaty even in the event that no agreement would have been reached on the ABM problem by the time it was to be signed. At the same time provision was made for our statement that if the ABM Treaty were violated, that would free us from our obligations under START.

Another complicated problem has been that of limiting heavy bombers, and also certain issues concerning monitoring. But thanks to the mutual efforts of the sides and their desire to achieve positive results, agreement was reached on those issues.

[TRUD] In conclusion, what is your assessment of the importance of the treaty for the security of our country?

[Lebedev] If we proceed from the premise that approximate balance was established during the 1970's between the USSR and the United States in terms of strategic forces, then arms reductions in line with the START treaty, which reduces the level of nuclear confrontation, will not upset that balance.

The START treaty will undoubtedly bring much that is positive in both the military and political aspects.

It is a first step providing for a significant reduction in the most powerful and dangerous weapons. Consequently, the level of nuclear confrontation will be lowered, and that means that the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war is reduced.

The treaty significantly augments the changes in sociopolitical thinking that have taken place in recent times and been reflected in the steady trend toward expanding cooperation between the USSR and the United States.

It is also important that the new treaty will be a good basis for further advance along the road of eliminating nuclear weapons. Factors such as the adjusted balance of military forces, the strengthening of mutual trust, and a more stable strategic situation will promote this.

Movement Welcomes Treaty Signing

OW0208051191 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1100 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Movement for Democratic Reforms welcomes the signing of the strategic arms reduction treaty

(START) by the Soviet and American Presidents, the movement announced in its statement. The act of signing these documents is of enormous importance not only for the USSR and the U.S., but also for the world as a whole, the statement points out.

According to the statement, this poses a very serious step in the particularly complicated and sensitive area of nuclear disarmament. As a result a considerable part of the two countries strategic arsenals will be liquidated. Besides, the treaty establishes tough enough restrictions and ceilings for many categories of strategic arms as well as provides for strict control over compliance with commitments under the treaty, including long-site inspections. The treaty will undoubtedly strengthen the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear arms and the maintenance of another treaty on limiting anti-missile defence systems.

Nevertheless the Movement for Democratic Reforms points out in its statement that the treaty could have been signed earlier if at the various stages of negotiations certain circles, including Soviet, which should be mentioned unequivocally, had not put up resistance to its signing. However attempts to upset the treaty failed.

But these attempts were not altogether futile, the statement goes on to say. Much will have to be done to strengthen mutual trust and prove that both sides are reliable partners at disarmament talks. Nonetheless the signing of the strategic arms reduction treaty (START) has restored the necessary dynamics in the Soviet-American relationship and opened new prospects in different directions.

According to the authors of the statement, the Moscow meeting between the Soviet and American Presidents "objectively served the interests of stabilizing the situation in this country and promoting democratisation processes in the USSR. To cut strategic arms and defence spending is a kind of direct investment in the Soviet economy. Moreover, it's a big contribution to the efforts to strengthen peace and international security".

TASS Views Treaty

LD0108171691 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT
1 Aug 91

[by TASS military analyst Valdimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—The signing in Moscow of the Soviet-U.S. Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) has produced nothing like the euphoria the world experienced when the two countries signed the intermediary nuclear force treaty in 1986 to scrap their medium and shorter range missiles.

Even before this new treaty was signed the world public was already inured to the thought that the threat of a catastrophic nuclear war had already been radically reduced. It is known that the Soviet-U.S. Moscow summit focused not around military but economic and political problems. The whirlpool of recent developments has

obfuscated the fact that arms to be restricted under the START treaty include B-52 bombers and non-nuclear cruise missiles which were used in the Gulf war a short time ago and caused thousands upon thousands of deaths.

However, the significance of the new treaty is by far not symbolic. It envisages the most significant reduction of armaments in mankind's history.

The SALT-2 treaty, that was never ratified and implemented, provided for the scrapping of about 300 Soviet and U.S. missiles or bombers. The START treaty provides for the scrapping within seven years of five to six times more strategic arms delivery vehicles.

The historic INF treaty reduced the total nuclear weapon nuclear tonnage by three-to-four percent. Under the treaty signed in Moscow this past Wednesday, nearly 48 percent of all Soviet and about 39 percent of all U.S. ballistic missile warheads will be eliminated.

Earlier specialists noted that the reduction of weapons as a result of negotiations lagged behind the actual arms growth during the period of conducting these negotiations. Now, as a result of the fulfillment of the START treaty, both sides will reach a strategic arms level which existed when the negotiations first began nine years ago. However, the treaty sets up no insurmountable barriers to the qualitative improvement of weapons which can reduce quantitative cuts to nil.

The Geneva negotiations were characterized by a patient search for mutually acceptable solutions. Compromise was at times reached in a most bizarre form. For instance, as the United States insisted, up to 20 nuclear bombs carried by a strategic bomber will be regarded as equal to one ballistic missile warhead. These bizarre rules for counting weapons resulted in cutting about one third of strategic weapons by each side instead of fifty percent as planned earlier. The USSR cuts somewhat more of its strategic weapons than the United States. In its time the United States demanded that the Soviet powerful SS-18 missiles be fully scrapped. But then a compromise solution was found—the Soviet Union will cut only half of its delivery vehicles of this kind.

The Soviet side eventually agreed to overlook naval cruise missiles in the present treaty. They are considered in a special protocol to the treaty. On the other hand, Washington made concessions to the Soviet side and agreed to legalise mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles with which only the Soviet Union is armed.

The START treaty has not solved all problems of ensuring peace on earth. Each side retains enough nuclear weapons to enable it to destroy life on earth many times over. Both sides need to ensure a continuous process of negotiations on the reduction of mass destruction weapons, including strategic. It is important to submit the START treaty for ratification by Soviet and U.S. legislators in time in order to avoid the fate that befell the 1979 SALT-2 treaty, the treaty that was signed

by U.S. President Jimmy Carter but was later formally rejected by his successor Ronald Reagan.

Officials on Geneva-2 Talks on Weapons Reductions

OW0208085091 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1430 GMT 1 Aug 91

[From "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The USSR and the U.S. might start consultations on cuts in nuclear and space weapons subject to strategic stability in the near future. According to officials from the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Department on Arms Control and Disarmament, this is envisaged in the statement coordinated by the Soviet and American Presidents back on June 1, 1990, during M. Gorbachev's first visit to Washington in the course of the G. Bush presidency. The two presidents agreed then that as soon as the START treaty is signed discussions will begin on further cuts in their nuclear arsenals. M. Gorbachev and G. Bush were mindful of their previous agreement when planning their further steps in the area of disarmament.

Consultations will involve a tangle of issues connected with concrete outlines of the future treaty and with all that belongs to the notion of strategic stability. The agreement to launch consultations without delay doesn't mean that they'll begin tomorrow. Nevertheless, as a Soviet Foreign Ministry expert said, there is no intention to delay this affair till the START treaty signed in Moscow recently is ratified by the U.S. Congress and by the Supreme Soviet. Consultations on the Geneva-2 talks might begin much earlier.

Preparations for CFE Implementation Under Way

91WC0140A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 27 Jul 91 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Lieutenant General A. Chernyshev, chief of staff of the North Caucasus Military District, by Colonel N. Astashkin, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent; place and date not given: "Inspection in the District"]

[Text] Preparatory work is now under way in the military districts located in the European part of the Soviet Union and also in the Western Group of Forces and the Northern Group of Forces, to ensure implementation of the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe [CFE]. As is known, this document envisages, in particular, the establishment of a military balance at levels lower than heretofore, elimination of the inequality in the correlation of weapons that harm stability and security, and elimination of the potential for launching a surprise attack.

Our correspondent discusses how preparations for implementation of the treaty are going ahead in the North Caucasus Military District with the district chief of staff, Lieutenant General A. Chernyshev.

[Astashkin] Anatoliy Kupriyanovich, how did this work start?

[Chernyshev] In February this year management organs were formed to ensure implementation of the treaty. At the district headquarters, for example, a special section was set up. There are analogous organizations in the large strategic formation. Methodological and training courses were held for the officers assigned to these organs, at which many practical questions were studied. In addition, the USSR National Center To Reduce the Nuclear Danger carried out test inspections here in the way that they will be conducted for real. At this time, all sites to be monitored in the initial scenario have been prepared for inspection. Practical training is now under way to organize on-site inspections.

[Astashkin] What kinds of difficulties are you encountering?

[Chernyshev] You understand that the range of issues is unusual. In order for the people recruited for the work of ensuring implementation of the treaty to carry out their duties successfully, they need a definite specialization. That is, essential skills and knowledge. It is no simple matter to acquire them in a short time. This, perhaps, is the main difficulty.

[Astashkin] Anatoliy Kupriyanovich, how will the activity of the inspection teams themselves be organized at the local level?

[Chernyshev] The sites to be visited by the foreign inspection groups on the territory of the district have already been decided. The time of arrival of inspection teams after they leave their point of departure (Moscow) to any point in the North Caucasus should, according to the treaty, be no longer than nine hours. You can see that the standard is very rigid. Therefore, in order to improve efficiency in the work of the inspection teams we plan to use aviation, road transport, and so forth.

[Astashkin] What will be the actual procedure in an inspection?

[Chernyshev] Everything is set forth in detail in the protocol on the inspections. Let me cite you just two factors. The inspection team may remain at an inspection site for no more than 48 hours. The number of inspectors in a group is not more than nine persons. The main purpose of the inspection is to check the number of weapons and equipment limited by the treaty, as stated in the most recent report, in the actual presence of the objects being inspected. In other words, to confirm in practice the responsibility for stability, trust, and security in Europe as stated by the treaty.

[Astashkin] And what if there is a "misalignment"?

[Chernyshev] These kinds of variations are covered by the treaty, for life does not stand still. For example, some equipment may be in the district, some may be in repair.

In such cases, at the pre-inspection briefings the senior people at the site being inspected will report on the number of weapons and equipment that are present at that given moment. And if there is a discrepancy they will explain when and where this equipment is, the means used to transport it, and whether or not it will be located at the inspection site in the future. If there is less equipment, a detailed explanation will be provided of where it is, where it may have been sent, and at what time.

[Astashkin] Along with the inspections there will surely be representatives of the mass media. What provisions are being made for them to do their work?

[Chernyshev] Journalists will receive exhaustive answers to questions relating to the substance of any inspection.

[Astashkin] Is cooperation planned with other organizations and military departments?

[Chernyshev] This kind of cooperation has already been put in place. First, appropriate documents have been drawn up providing for this. Second, we have been meeting directly with representatives of the branches of the USSR Armed Forces, primarily the Air Force and the Air Defense Forces, whose units also fall within the purview of the treaty and are sites to be inspected. Third and last, we have studied the possibility of organizing and conducting inspections also in regions where the armed troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] and USSR Committee for State Security [KGB] are located, in All-Union Voluntary Society for Assistance to the Army, Air Force, and Navy of the USSR [DOSAAF] training centers, and so forth. It should be said that under the terms of the treaty, MVD and KGB units are not subject to inspections but they may be checked on request, with right of refusal. Accordingly, contact has been established directly with those units and their locations, communications, and notifications have been checked out.

[Astashkin] A final question: Are you confident that the officers, warrant officers, sergeants, and enlisted men who will ensure the work of the foreign inspection teams on the territory of the district will carry out in a worthy manner the task that they face?

[Chernyshev] Unconditionally. During the courses and practical training exercises and talks everyone was convinced that the upcoming measures are not simply an accounting by some particular unit or subunit in the district for its weapons and equipment. It is an account rendered by the country with respect to implementation of the CFE treaty. In other words, we are representing our state here. Hence there is also the measure of responsibility.

We are also aware of the innovative nature of the issue. For the nature of relations between the states party to the treaty have changed in a radical way. Confrontation is being replaced by peaceful coexistence, and we are ready to cooperate actively in this process.

World Economic Forum To Be Held in Moscow

PM0108155091 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA
in Russian 31 Jul 91 p 1

[Unattributed report: "A Productive Fall Lies Ahead"]

[Text] It has been decided to hold the World Economic Forum in Moscow 5-7 September. Leaders of world economic policy and business will participate in one of the most prestigious of meetings. Our country will be represented by the USSR Scientific and Industrial Union. A. Vladislavlev, vice president of the Scientific and Industrial Union, spoke about this at a briefing yesterday.

The main work of the forum will be concentrated in nine main groups, each corresponding to a sector of industry. The Scientific and Industrial Union is prepared to submit some 50 major projects for investment programs. Thus the country's assembled business forces want, for the first time, to combine the general publicistic orientation of such forums with the tackling of practical tasks.

Furthermore, also in early September, the Scientific and Industrial Union proposes to hold a meeting of leaders of unions of industrialists from leading European powers in the capital.

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gives Briefing 1 Aug

Support for Nuclear-Free Zone Announced

LD0108144391 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT
1 Aug 91

[By Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—The Soviet Union supports the initiative put forward by the North Korean Government after July 30 calling on North and South Korea to create a nuclear-free zone on the Korean peninsula and adopt to this end a joint declaration not later than by the end of 1992, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

"The Soviet Union supports this North Korea's initiative and believes it could be a subject for a discussion by all states concerned," Churkin said.

"If North Korea and South Korea reach agreement to declare the Korean peninsula a nuclear-free zone, our country, as a nuclear state, will be ready together with other nuclear powers [to] give the necessary guarantees to observe the zone's nuclear-free status," Churkin said.

He also stressed that the Soviet Union pays much attention to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world, including by creating nuclear-free zones, and that the problem of nuclear security is vital for the Korean peninsula, since it is overfilled with armed forces and armaments and the military-political confrontation still exists here.

The turning of the peninsula into a zone free from weapons of mass destruction could help overcome the suspiciousness of the Korean sides toward each other, normalise the whole situation in Korea and strengthen the international regime of nuclear arms, Churkin said.

Fishermen's Plight in Nigeria Viewed

LD0108173191 Moscow TASS in English 1613 GMT
1 Aug 91

[By Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin, at a briefing here today spoke of the plight of the crews of several Soviet fishing vessels in Nigeria. They were stranded in the port of Lagos without funds, stocks of food and fuel. Disease affected the fishermen. One of them died and five are in a critical state.

Churkin said that the tragedy resulted from the unscrupulousness of the ships' lessee, SOV-ES joint stock company, and their owners concluding the contract, [words indistinct] fishermen's health and their living and working conditions.

He said the Soviet Foreign Ministry had taken measures "to clarify the situation to the agencies that are equipped to find the way out". The Soviet Embassy in Nigeria tried to do its utmost to ease the difficulties of the crews and help solve their problems.

The spokesman said that according to the latest information "Rosrybkhoz" amalgamation provided hard currency to pay for the passage of ailing fishermen home and for the shipment of the coffin with the body to the Soviet Union.

The fish-freezing vessel Oka is to arrive at Lagos on August 4. It will supply the crews with food and the vessels with fuel for the return run. A salvage ship will also arrive at Lagos on August 7-8.

Swedish Test Ban Proposal Hailed

LD0108152891 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1345 GMT 1 Aug 91

[By Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Aug (TASS)—The Soviet Union gives a positive appraisal of the new draft treaty on an all-embracing ban on nuclear tests that the Swedish delegation submitted the other day for examination at the disarmament conference in Geneva. This was stated today at a briefing by Vitaliy Churkin, chief of the information directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

This Swedish draft, the Soviet diplomat noted, takes into account the experience of talks on other types of weapons, in particular chemical weapons, the results of

the work of the group of seismological experts, and also a number of proposals from other countries that have been submitted both to the disarmament conference and to the conference to examine amendments to the Moscow Treaty of 1963.

"Soviet experts, naturally, will closely study the new Swedish document," Vitaliy Churkin said. "At the same time, one may appraise it even now as yet another important step to solve the problem of a ban on nuclear tests, which is welcomed by the Soviet Union."

Great Belt Bridge Discussed

*LD0108155891 Moscow TASS in English 1456 GMT
1 Aug 91*

[By Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin on Thursday commented on the international court's decision on the Dutch-Finnish dispute on building a bridge across the Baltic Straits Great Belt by Denmark.

He said the court decision that at present there is no need to take temporary measures to protect the Finnish side's interests, since the court intends to consider the case in essence by the autumn of [word indistinct] and bring in a verdict.

Churkin stressed that the court called on the disputing sides to settle the issue on a bilateral mutually acceptable basis.

The Soviet Union is interested in a solution made according to international law on the freedom of navigation through international [word indistinct] which will not prevent drilling platforms and other ships from passing Great Belt.

TASS Summarizes Briefing

*LD0108193691 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT
1 Aug 91*

[By Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Aleksandr Kainishchev]

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin, at a briefing on Thursday, touched upon the programme of President of the Yugoslav Federal Executive Council Ante Markovic's two-day visit to the Soviet Union.

On Thursday, Markovic had talks with Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov and was expected to meet Russian President Boris Yeltsin later in the day.

Markovic will meet Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev early on Friday to discuss bilateral relations and ways to settle the crisis in Yugoslavia.

On Thursday, Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh had conversations with Deputy Yugoslav Foreign Minister Milivoje Maksic.

The Soviet Union supports the initiative put forward by the North Korean Government after July 30 calling on North and South Korea to create a nuclear-free zone on the Korean Peninsula and adopt to this end a joint declaration not later than by the end of 1992, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

"If North Korea and South Korea reach agreement to declare the Korean Peninsula a nuclear-free zone, our country, as a nuclear state, will be ready together with other nuclear powers give the necessary guarantees to observe the zone's nuclear-free status," Churkin said.

Commenting on the results of U.S. President George Bush's visit to the Soviet Union, Churkin confirmed that both presidents exchanged opinions on a possible place to host a Middle East peace conference but did not come to an agreement and this issue has yet to be considered together with all participants in the future conference.

Speaking about Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh's visit to the Middle East, Churkin said that the minister has not planned such a visit for the near future.

Touching upon prospects for establishing diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel, Churkin said "we believe that our relations with Israel are developing and the time will come when they will be established. However, we cannot say when this will happen".

Speaking on prospects for disarmament talks, Churkin said that this issue was discussed during the negotiations. He expressed surprise at some statements that the Soviet Union insists on continuing arms reduction talks, while the United States refuses to participate in them. "I should say that this is not true. We have reached a good understanding with the U.S. side on this issue: the talks should continue. The sides have come to an understanding that soon, some time in October, the Soviet Union and the United States will begin consultations on future talks on strategic offensive arms reduction. Talks on defence and space issues, the second part of the matter, will also continue, Churkin said.

UN Official Presents Chernobyl Conference Report

*LD0208040391 Moscow TASS in English 1517 GMT
1 Aug 91*

[By Aleksey Petrov]

[Text] Vienna August 1 TASS—The presentation of a report for the forthcoming conference on Chernobyl was made at Austria International Centre today. The report contains a joint plan for international cooperation in the elimination of consequences of the Chernobyl nuclear accident.

Director General of the United Nations Vienna office, U.N. Under Secretary General Margaret Joan Anstee, coordinator of the programme for international cooperation on Chernobyl, told reporters that the joint plan had been prepared by the governments of the USSR, the Russian Federation, the Ukraine and Belorussia in cooperation with the United Nations coordinator. The plan will be discussed at a regular session of the U.N. General Assembly and will be sent to governments so that they should prepare their proposals and decide on specific areas on joint measures.

Anstee said that according to the joint plan the expenditures for medical care, resettlement of residents of the

contaminated districts, restoration of the food industry and agriculture and other functions will make up \$646 million.

The report contains special programmes on Chernobyl aimed at the improvement of the health services, education and science. Experts of UNESCO and of the World Health Organisation participated in the drafting of the report.

Anstee expressed the hope that various international and governmental organisations, businessmen and individuals will participate in the implementation of the programme.

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Bush-Gorbachev Summit

Preview of Meeting

PM0108132591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 91 p 3

[Article by A. Vasilyev: "Moscow Meeting Bound To Succeed: Preface to Today's Dialogue between Gorbachev and Bush"]

[Text] The final decision on holding the Soviet-American summit meeting in Moscow was taken during the London G-7 summit. It is logical therefore to begin the analysis of present relations between the USSR and the United States with an analysis of the results of the G-7 meeting.

Much has already been said about what Gorbachev obtained and did not obtain in London. However, in addition to the six-point program regarding the Soviet Union which was adopted, the G-7 discussed the following questions: the world economy and international trade, East Europe, problems of environmental protection, drugs, population migration, the situation in the Lebanon, the situation in Yugoslavia, the situation in Iraq, and the Arab-Israeli conflict. In short, discussion among the leaders of the leading Western countries has long gone beyond those countries' direct interests and is global in nature.

In my view, a trend toward the gradual replacement of the United Nations and the UN Security Council, in particular, by the G-7 conference has emerged. The West is energetically building a "new world order" on the basis again of Western notions of democracy and political and economic freedom. And there is scarcely any doubt that if such an order can be established in principle, it will come about more swiftly and better under those seven "architects" than that large motley crew known as the United Nations.

First, the G-7 really does bring together the most powerful states in political, economic, and military terms. Second, these are similar states which think and act according to the same model. They form a compact group which is capable, if need be, of taking swift and decisive action, which they demonstrated in the Persian Gulf and in tackling the problems of the Kurds in the north of Iraq. Third, the G-7 includes German and Japan—countries without which it is impossible to imagine the modern political spectrum and which are not at the same time permanent members of the UN Security Council.

Of course, the leaders of the leading Western powers and George Bush, first and foremost, have repeatedly stated the need to enhance the United Nations' role and of their devotion to its ideals. But practice shows that this extremely heteroclit organization, bogged down in bureaucracy and political squabbles, is in no way fitted

to perform the "world government" role, since it is incapable of responding to the challenges of the modern world. It is enough to recall how long and hard U.S. Secretary of State James Baker had to seek to persuade certain Security Council members to give their assent to military action against Saddam Husayn.

In the end the United States crushed Iraq under the UN "umbrella," but it would be naive to suppose that it would not have done the same even without UN Security Council agreement. Washington has always been ready to work within the United Nations while it benefits it to do so.

It makes sense to examine the present state of Soviet-American relations against this background.

Let us remember that the foreign policy component of the concept of perestroika was initially aimed at isolating the United States and cutting off West Europe, Japan, and the countries of the Third World from it. Subsequently, as the economic situation in the Soviet Union deteriorated, the strategy changed: Moscow began talking about equal partner relations between the two world superpowers—the USSR and the United States—which frightened the Third World and alarmed West Europe and Japan. And now we have a new stage: The Kremlin face to face with the G-7.

The Soviet Union, as it gradually slides into the status of a third world country, confronts the United States and its allies with a question: What is most beneficial to them at a time when the dividing line is not between West and East, but between North and South—to enable the USSR to shift to the "south" or to make efforts to keep it in the "north"? It seems that the Western powers have come to the same opinion: It is better to have Moscow as a junior partner somewhere in the vicinity of the G-7 than to "assign" it to the tropical undergrowth of the Third World.

George Bush remains interested in holding talks with Gorbachev about reducing offensive arms and, in particular, signing the treaty, which will take place tomorrow. That is why the Americans are showing such interest in converting Soviet military enterprises. And the Americans too are reducing the number of such enterprises and switching them to the production of goods for civil purposes. But while reducing their armed forces the United States and its allies are also carrying out modernization, putting the emphasis on mobile, rapid-response subunits and smart weapons, which did a first-rate job in the Persian Gulf. They are overtaking us on this curve in the road: Because of the lag existing in many spheres of modern science and technology we will be unable to catch up with or overtake the Americans, West Europeans, and Japanese. Of course, we do need conversion: Fewer MiGs means more saucepans. The point is that the West does not have a saucepan problem....

The following question is often asked: Is Washington really interested in a strong central power existing in the

USSR? For the time being the USSR has nuclear missiles—that is an indisputable fact. And Bush does need Gorbachev—a man who has a knack for evaluating a situation and with whom agreement can be reached.

Moreover, the American President, engaged in building a "new world order," wants to "restore" things a little in the sphere of regional problems: The Near East, Afghanistan, Cuba, and so forth. By all accounts, these questions will also be discussed during the Moscow meeting.

The White House is also interested in keeping Gorbachev in the Kremlin not just because it is simpler to negotiate on arms and regional conflicts with him than with individual republic-states. The West needs a centrist in Moscow who serves as a buffer between the democrats and the conservatives and who at the same time moves along with the whole of society in the direction required both by us and the West—toward the market, democracy, and a community of autonomous republic-states. That is why it is also expected that President Bush will announce at the meeting the extension of Most Favored Nation status to the Soviet Union. This means that the duty levied on Soviet goods imported into the United States will fall from 35 to 7 percent. Almost all states in the world enjoy most-favored nation status with the United States and in general we have nothing to export to America, so the event should be assessed soberly.

Gorbachev needs a success very much, and the White House is very interested in Soviet people seeing Gorbachev's policy as successful, so the Moscow summit meeting is bound to mark up another achievement in Soviet-American relations.

Gorbachev Speaks at Bush Dinner

*LD3107173891 Moscow TASS in English 1728 GMT
31 Jul 91*

[Moscow TASS in English at 1915 GMT on 31 July transmits a brief service message which kills the following item]

[Text] Moscow July 31 TASS—In his reply speech, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev said, in particular, that by signing the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms, the Soviet Union and the U.S. had accomplished the mission entrusted to them by history.

"Ten years of work have now been completed... today's milestone will be a starting point for further progress," he said.

The Soviet president pointed to the need to pool the intellectual and moral resources of modern civilization in order to channel more resolutely the energies spent on the weapons of deterrence towards constructive, peaceful purposes.

What is needed is a model of a new world order that would be in line with man's highest mission and take due

account of the principles of freedom of choice and the balance of interests of nations and states.

Such a world order may only be based on the universal human values of liberty, democracy, human rights, tolerance, solidarity and cooperation.

In this connection, Gorbachev pinned great hopes on the United Nations which is a unique instrument at the service of the world community.

Bush Gives Dinner for Gorbachev

*LD3107172691 Moscow TASS in English 1714 GMT
31 Jul 91*

[Moscow TASS in English at 1915 GMT on 31 July transmits a brief service message which kills the following item]

[Text] Moscow July 31 TASS—U.S. President George Bush today gave a dinner for Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Raisa Gorbachev at his residence at Spaso house in Moscow.

The two leaders exchanged brief speeches.

Welcoming the Soviet guests, Bush said, in part, that his visit to Moscow aims to strengthen further relationship with the Soviet government and with all Soviet peoples, to launch a new era of hope. Despite political differences, the U.S. and the Soviet Union can move forward together.

Americans, Bush continued, "Want to work with the Soviet people to establish a partnership in the new world order" based on the rule of law and freedoms. The U.S. President noted that U.S.-Soviet relations are built not only by politicians and statesmen in Moscow and Washington "but in a more profound way by our peoples".

He expressed conviction that the U.S. and the Soviet Union can build a lasting peace.

Further on Press Conference

*PM0108125191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Aug 91 Second Edition pp 4-5*

[TASS report: "Soviet and U.S. Presidents' Joint Press Conference"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush held a joint afternoon press conference 31 July. Before answering journalists' questions, the presidents made brief statements.

Addressing correspondents, M.S. Gorbachev noted that the U.S. President's official visit to the Soviet Union had been filled with a substantive [osnovatelnyy] dialogue on a broad range of problems. We assess this visit, he said, as a major event in our relations and as an event of world importance.

Such a great deal of work has been done during the past few days that it would be hard for either me or the U.S.

President to present its results in condensed form. To a certain extent the visit sums up the results of the last stage in our cooperation at this very crucial and perhaps even dramatic time in the development of world events. Both the United States and the Soviet Union found themselves in exceptional, difficult, and unusual conditions. These required enormous responsibility and the adoption of major decisions on which the future development of both our cooperation and world events will depend.

Thus, the President and I lost no time at our first meeting in immediately reviewing the general situation in our rapidly changing world. We attempted to look at our cooperation from this standpoint, to assess our joint efforts, and to outline the contours and avenues for developing this cooperation in line with the changing conditions in which we are forced to operate.

The President showed great interest in events in our country and domestic processes. I tried to satisfy this interest, and, for my part, was very happy to do so, since I felt that behind this interest lay a desire to gain a deeper understanding of what is happening in our country. Moreover, I sensed a manifestation of solidarity.

Our interesting and substantive discussions probably reached this level in our bilateral cooperation for the first time. It was probably the first time in recent years that we have placed quite major emphasis on economic relations—in order to ensure that relations in this important sphere correspond to the level of political dialogue achieved.

We stated, on the basis of understanding, I think—and if this is not the case, President Bush will say so—that there should be give and take in this movement. Naturally, we should do a great deal on the path of reform in order to become organically involved in world economic relations and accept the general rules of the game. I admit that I like this old, tried, and tested term—another has not been invented yet. We have made our choice—to continue reform and democratic transformations, and now to move toward market relations with particular determination.

Our success in internal affairs is linked to a considerable extent with the process of reforming the federation, and on this score I told the U.S. President the present state of the process. We both realize that this is of great importance. Thus, we must change, we must understand—and here in the Soviet Union we do understand very well—that chief responsibility for the fate of the country, for reform, and for the adoption of the most important and serious decisions lies with us.

Naturally, we are very interested in more fruitful cooperation with the Western countries, and we discussed this subject in the context of continuing the London discussion. I tried to develop the thesis which I stated in London with regard to the fact that we are hoping for reciprocal movement from the Western countries, since

they too should travel a definite way in their approaches to the sphere of economic cooperation.

It is a question of removing the obstacles and restrictions linked with the decisions adopted during the "cold war" and arms race years. Times have changed now, different winds are blowing, and we are building our relations differently. We want not only to preserve them but also to make them more dynamic, relying more and more firmly on trust.

The question also arose of the Soviet Union's participation in international economic organizations. And subsequently—I must say this—we discussed, perhaps for the first time in such a substantive fashion, spheres of specific cooperation in the implementation of plans based on bilateral ties. Briefly, we spoke in this area about cooperation in the sphere of power generation—particularly in the conversion sphere, which has very great potential. We are also very interested in cooperation in the sphere of food, particularly as concerns the distribution sphere. I handed over certain materials in the form of a memorandum to the President, and Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh handed Secretary of State Baker a memorandum on the projects where we could fruitfully cooperate. In implementing these very major and very interesting projects, we want to give each other opportunities to earn some money and gain some benefit.

But there are spheres of cooperation where there will be no opportunity to settle accounts through additional output. The food sphere, for instance. There could be interesting achievements in this area and interesting projects could be implemented. But we need what would be obtained as a result. We have a food problem, it is very acute. But we cannot offer food to the United States, it has no interest in this. This means that we must implement other projects where we could earn hard currency and settle accounts. I mentioned some of these spheres. In general, we agreed to continue this work. We will soon have competent groups of specialists headed by major representatives from the government and business circles in order to implement these projects.

For the first time we very thoroughly discussed the sphere of bilateral relations—not only as regards questions of disarmament, political dialogue, and cooperation in resolving world problems. We had a businesslike discussion. I welcome this. I hope that it will have positive consequences. The President and I then thought about what would happen next. We have already signed the treaty. We congratulated each other, our peoples, and the world on achieving such immense progress—the result of almost 10 years' work. What next?

We would not want to just be pragmatic. We would like to look at the security and stability problem from the standpoint of current realities. Either we should continue purely with the negotiating processes already under way and where there are still many problems outstanding, or we should think about and look at the world

from a somewhat different standpoint—from today's vantage point and with an understanding of the new realities which have arisen.

I believe this was the central point of our exchange of opinions, since it is hard to find the keys to unlock specific problems without having sorted things out and without having understood each other. We agreed to continue the discussion on these issues and even defined mechanisms which should be brought into play in the interests of their elaboration.

We then examined many specific disarmament questions. We did not overlook the Near East problem. I want to state that we have elaborated a joint document on this subject. I am referring to our common position on the Near East. It strikes me as being a very important result of our joint work. I think that the fact that this position will be publicized will have a major impact on the entire process. It is currently in a decisive phase, and we should exploit—and here I want to use our foreign ministers' expression—the current window of opportunity to achieve real progress in this very sensitive sphere of international politics.

The President and I talked about the situation in Europe in the context of the implementation of the accords concluded in the Helsinki documents and the Paris Charter and taking account of the features of the processes in the region. Specifically, we particularly highlighted the question of the position in Yugoslavia. In a joint statement on the Yugoslavia situation we expressed our attitude to, position on, and understanding of the approach to the resolution of this very acute problem, which concerns us all.

We also tried to look at many global processes and, in this connection, did not overlook essentially many questions of world politics. We compared views and in certain areas reserved the right to return to them later, postponing the discussion for the time being. Sometimes the Americans needed to consult, at other times we needed time to study certain issues. But this means that the process will be continuing. And in this case we stated the need for cooperation and collaboration in resolving the many international problems which really exist and are awaiting resolution.

The atmosphere at the talks was very warm, sincere, cordial, and open. Today we were able to have a heart-to-heart talk outside the city—since the gentlemen of the press were resting and, we were told, did not want to disturb us. This talk was important too. I asked one delegation member, a rather influential person, the question: "How do you feel?" And I received the answer: "At home." That indeed was the atmosphere in which we worked.

I am satisfied that political dialogue is developing in this way. I want to repeat—and I told the President this—that I am convinced that if Soviet-U.S. relations were not the way they are now, everything that has happened in the past few years would hardly have been possible. We

could hardly have cooperated in such a way when the world was setting us very complex tasks and problems. And, had we found ourselves facing such acute situations at another time, it would be hard to say how they would have developed.

Today we have realized still further the value of our cooperation. That is why it is not a question of "platonic love" here, but of a profound understanding of the fact that we need each other as countries and as states today and tomorrow. I know and sense that our peoples welcome this atmosphere and this direction in the development of relations between our countries. So, from this standpoint, the visit is taking our cooperation further forward.

G. Bush then spoke.

May I take this opportunity to thank President Gorbachev on behalf of myself and Barbara for this truly fantastic hospitality, he said.

Undoubtedly, I cannot fail to agree that the talks have been productive and that we have deepened our mutual understanding. That's not diplomatic language, that's a fact.

You know my view on the START Treaty. It is really a question of the culmination of long talks of historic importance, of an event which most benefits young people not only in the Soviet Union and the United States, but also throughout the world.

The sides are now taking major steps to transform economic relations between the two countries. President Gorbachev has touched on a number of aspects of this sphere. For our part, we intend sending a trade agreement to Congress for ratification. Now that technical details have been resolved, we are planning to grant the USSR Most Favored Nation status. So the aim set in Malta of normalizing economic relations between our countries has been met. Here we agreed to go further, responding to the new challenges of the time, in the context of what Mr. Gorbachev has been talking about—the continuation of economic reform in the USSR and the search for ways to integrate the Soviet economy into the world system. We are moving forward in the sphere of cooperation in space research and environmental protection. There are a number of joint projects in these spheres.

On the basis of our historic cooperation during the Persian Gulf crisis we discussed questions of partnership in solving protracted regional problems: Yugoslavia, Central America, and others. I will dwell briefly on the Near East. We reaffirmed our common adherence to the cause of peace and genuine reconciliation between the Arab states, Israel, and the Palestinians. We believe that there is now a historic opportunity to launch a process which would lead to a just and lasting peace, and to a Near East settlement.

We are both convinced that we should not waste this historic opportunity. We realize that peace cannot be imposed, peace can only result from direct negotiations between the sides. The United States and the Soviet Union have pledged to do everything possible to promote the process of achieving peace, and, to this end, the United States and the USSR—as cochairmen—intend to convene a conference in October in order to initiate bilateral and multilateral talks. Invitations to the conference will be sent out 10 days before it starts. In the interim, Secretary of State Baker and Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh will continue working with the sides to prepare for the conference. I have asked the secretary of state to return once again to the Near East in order to obtain Israel's reply to our proposals on a peaceful settlement.

Once more I would like to thank you all.

[Question] What precisely was discussed, Mr Gorbachev, when you broached the problem of Yugoslavia? And a question for the U.S. President: In your view, are the special relations between Yugoslavia and the United States preserved today, does the United States still support the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia?

[M.S. Gorbachev] I shall describe the content of the Soviet-U.S. statement on Yugoslavia. It contains the results, the essence of our discussion on this theme.

Both sides noted with deep concern the dramatic development of the situation in Yugoslavia. We advocated avoiding the use of force and urged all sides to observe the cease-fire accord. The USSR and the United States proceed from the premise that the solution of the problems that have emerged must be found by the Yugoslav peoples themselves. On the basis of democratic principles and by a process of peace negotiations and constructive actions.

We stressed the need for all sides to respect the fundamental principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act and the Paris Charter. The USSR and the United States support the efforts undertaken by the CSCE member countries and in particular the demarches of the EC to settle the problems.

[G. Bush] I would add that since we are talking about the joint statement it also sets out our invariable position.

Question: Has Israel agreed to your conditions for holding a peace conference?

[G. Bush] I would like to give Baker the opportunity to answer that question after his next trip. I have a greater sense of optimism now.

[Question] You discussed a broad range of international bilateral problems and signed a unique treaty. What have you left for the next meeting?

[M.S. Gorbachev] The things that we discussed today and set in motion—political dialogue, the continuation of the disarmament process, and the new themes relating

to economic cooperation and trade, collaboration in resolving major problems, including regional conflicts; the fact that we have initiated a big discussion on the concept of the future strategic stability—all this indicates that there are enough questions, I think, for several more meetings. Therefore, our contacts will continue.

The President and I hold a regular exchange of opinions by telephone. As soon as a need or worry arises, we phone one another.

Second, we regularly exchange letters and, incidentally, that exchange of opinions has not even been interrupted in the past few days when we were expecting the President's official visit. Thus we have many channels for maintaining this very high level of cooperation which we now have. I think that a major role will be played here by the foreign ministries and other departments.

[G. Bush] I can add that although the timetable has not been drawn up, I consider and always have considered that meetings without an agenda are sometimes useful. President Gorbachev mentioned arms control and regional and other problems. As the Soviet economy begins to build up momentum we shall have new themes for discussion in the economic sphere; cooperation, partnership, joint ventures. There is a whole series of points which could be of great benefit to the Soviet Union and the United States. I see great potential here. We have things to talk about and I will be ready for such a meeting.

[Question] President Gorbachev, there has been a shocking incident on the border with Lithuania. Several people died. Could you provide some clarification? President Bush, what is your reaction especially if one takes into account your appeal yesterday for freedom in the Baltic republics?

[M.S. Gorbachev] As it happens we received the news when we were talking with President Bush out of town. The first version was as follows. The incident took place on the border between Lithuania and Belorussia at a customs point. A Belorussian citizen was advancing in the direction of Lithuania and saw two wounded people and apparently four dead at the customs point. He rapidly reported this information and the Lithuanian and Belorussian security organs are now cooperating. Kryuchkov, chairman of the union KGB, has offered his services in cooperation. So the investigation is under way.

In addition to sympathy, grief, and condolences in connection with the people's death I must say that we are making every effort to avoid such excesses and acute conflicts. After all, look at what happens. It seems that we have already reached the stage of adopting radical joint decisions on questions affecting the interests of Armenia and Azerbaijan. Dialogue has been initiated, but the more productive it becomes, the more attempts are manifested to thwart it. Consequently, not everyone likes the fact that this dialogue has achieved its aim.

[G. Bush] I should like also to express regret to the families of the dead for what has happened. I know that the president immediately took up the question and has set about an investigation which we hope will proceed with the cooperation of both Lithuania and Belorussia.

[Question] How far have you come since London in the discussion of the problems of the USSR's integration into the world economy?

[G. Bush] The USSR's emergence to active participation in international financial institutions and the special status which was determined for the USSR in London are very important to the Soviet Union. As you have already heard today, I reported some trade advantages for the USSR—that is also a step forward since the London meeting was held. But the USSR's full participation in international financial institutions requires a full knowledge of specific steps in privatization and the convertibility of currency, a knowledge of what the Soviet Union is striving for. In the bilateral respect we have done what we could. I think other countries will do the same to destroy the obstacles and barriers on the path of bilateral economic cooperation, and international organizations will seek to initiate cooperation with the Soviet leaders.

[M.S. Gorbachev] London laid the foundation to a very important process. It is very important that after London the desire appeared on both sides to develop mechanisms which would facilitate the practical implementation of cooperation and would specifically develop the decisions taken by the Western countries' leaders. In turn here in the Soviet Union we think that we should have special structures which would deal with the topic of the Soviet Union's cooperation with the countries of the "seven," primarily on questions of investments.

I shall explain: Here the process of taking decisions which accord with mutual interests was facilitated. And it is a good thing that the mechanism envisaged in London is already beginning to operate and that the British chancellor of the exchequer is already here on a visit. That is the first point. We spoke about how there would also be a visit by the U.S. secretary of the treasury. In the near future an FRG representative will visit. That is there will be a process, a mechanism will form for the specific working through of all specific avenues of cooperation. It is very important that a mechanism of real collaboration be created.

And finally the President mentioned that the United States is taking an important decision which will facilitate cooperation and trade between our countries. I asked the President—and in my opinion there is such an agreement—to study this question because a very many progressive, major finished projects worth billions, in some places projects which have even been signed by businessmen, are not being implemented but are lying around because there are elements which are on the COCOM [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls] prohibited list.

There was a very serious process. I think that if it is continued and gathers strength and acquires specific form, then that will produce results. There is the will, there is the desire, the aspiration, to go halfway to meet us. That is very important.

[Question] I should like to recall the meeting in Reykjavik in 1986. At the time U.S. nuclear experts and all Europeans were seriously examining your proposals, Mr Gorbachev, for a total ban on nuclear tests. But at the time they believed that nuclear deterrence was maintaining peace and at the time you had the nuclear advantage. After that the treaty on intermediate-range missiles was signed. Do you still believe that nuclear deterrence strengthens peace? After all if your country collapses, the republics will have nuclear weapons.

[G. Bush] I do not think that any seceding republics will use weapons against the United States. But we believe that we are indeed worried about the possible emergence in the world of cases of such people having nuclear weapons. That is why in the Senate now we are examining programs for curbing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Other countries do indeed have nuclear weapons. Not only the United States and the Soviet Union. And we believe that we are now proceeding along the correct path. The path defined today by President Gorbachev in concluding the existing agreement—that is it is hardly necessary to give a utopian reply, let's think in practical terms, as he suggests. As far as the United States is concerned, we should also like to elaborate a system which would not entail any danger, danger of an accidental launch. I think that here we can also use the experience of the Iraq war. Of course, President Gorbachev may have a different concept. But here it is a case of the concept of using high technology for defense.

[M.S. Gorbachev] I will say a couple of words about the argument which you want to ascribe to me as though at one time in my policy I viewed nuclear weapons as a deterrent element. You will not find that in my speeches or my position. Yes, we were nearly drawn into a very grave arms race. In simple Russian, thank god we stopped it and not only stopped it but also reversed the process. But it is not easy to rake away this mountain of accumulated weapons and I think there is still a lot of work ahead.

We have already considered a certain amount for the immediate future. Then questions will probably arise for all members of the nuclear club. And they must consider how we are to act with nuclear weapons in future. And finally we must be very attentive in connection with the mechanism which we have created and which has been working, but nonetheless not effectively enough, against the proliferation of nuclear weapons. For us this subject has been an important one recently in our talks with the President. After all, if some people proceed along the path of disarmament, the path toward a nuclear-free world, while at the same time others find paths to turn the process in such a way as to acquire their own nuclear weapons, an absurd situation will be created. That is

why, in continuing and retaining our allegiance to nuclear disarmament and acting within the framework of negotiations processes which we have, we have agreed to continue them.

The question arises of us engaging thoroughly in the improvement of the mechanism for the nonproliferation of missile technology and nuclear technology in order to place an insuperable obstacle on the path of the proliferation of nuclear weapons. I think that today that is a very important task.

[Question] Mikhail Sergeyevich, what significance do problems of European integration have in your talks with the U.S. President? What postwar vision of a united Europe is the most acceptable from your viewpoint for the Soviet Union?

[M.S. Gorbachev] First, in speaking of what is happening in the world we always come to Europe one way or another. What is happening in Europe on all salients and at all points is of decisive importance for the development of processes throughout the world. That is why the President and I noted the positive changes which have developed in Europe and our allegiance to the documents aimed at creating a new Europe. We believe that both the Soviet Union and the United States should be the most active participants in building a new Europe. This understanding remains, and the responsibility exists.

But you ask what kind of Europe? I think that perhaps you are being somewhat hasty, because when we create a scheme and then try to introduce or to impose it that is one thing. But when a process is developing within the framework of the Helsinki political choice, then we gradually find new forms of cooperation and new institutions emerge. I would not put it like this: Within the framework of the documents, of the common course enshrined in the Helsinki final act and the Paris charter, we must act in such a way that old institutions are transformed in the interests of the new Europe so that they serve the interests of a single economic space, a single security for Europe, a single legal and cultural space and energy space.

But in addition we will obviously also proceed along the path of the emergence of new institutions.

If we are now implementing the plan for a single energy space, then a mechanism of collaboration and management will unfailingly emerge. Without destroying old institutions but transforming them to meet the demands of the new and by creating new mechanisms we will probably gradually, step by step, find forms of resolving questions.

But if we only declare a course while retaining the old structures unchanged, that could again lead only to the regrouping of forces in Europe, to confrontation with a different placement of forces. I am in favor of promoting the process of creating new institutions and encouraging the development of those trends which have moved us to

the unification of Europe. I do not think that languages, cultures, and traditions should disappear here. I think it would be a mistake if we were to set such an initial aim. We must consider the peoples' features, traditions, and history, but move toward their union and cooperation. Life shows that these are compatible aims. Although, of course, we can see that there are eruptions of nationalism and separatism and attempts to review and shake up everything. That is dangerous. I think that if we proceed along the path of the chaotic development of these processes we may end up in a bad situation. That is why I am in favor of the transformation of old institutions, in favor of new institutions which would operate in the interests of the unification processes in Europe.

Bush Speech to Businessmen Noted

PM0208074991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Aug 91 Second Edition pp 4,5

[Unattributed report: "Conversation With Businessmen"]

[Text] Over 100 Soviet and American entrepreneurs met 31 July at the recently opened "Slavyanskaya-Radisson" hotel in the center of Moscow for a meeting with U.S. President G. Bush.

Unlike similar events in previous years, the present working lunch was organized primarily for businessmen and representatives of the nonstate sector of the economy. And this was not surprising. As U.S. ambassador J. Matlock noted when opening the meeting, the USSR's guest, in this case the hospitable host George Bush, was himself not so long ago the founder and director of a well-established oil company.

Sitting at the same table as Bush were P. Bunich, president of the Union of Entrepreneurs and Leaseholders; A. Vladislavlev, vice president of the USSR Science and Industry Union; and V. Tikhnov, president of the USSR Union of Allied Cooperatives.

George Bush's Speech

The future prosperity of the Soviet union depends on you, entrepreneurs, business people, people who are involved in ventures. It is in your power to build a better life for yourselves and your compatriots. There is an old Russian saying "The man who walks ahead paves the way for the others." Entrepreneurs such as yourselves are paving the way toward the establishment of a new and prosperous Soviet Union.

We can see that throughout the world free society is founded on a double basis of political and economic freedom. Because it is only on the basis of cooperation between free markets and free people that you can build a better life for everyone.

You see, possibilities arise when people operate freely, relying on their capabilities. Call this what you like, skill, inventiveness, or a position on the basis of the principle: "I can do this." However, all this boils down to the fact

that people must be free in order to work, in order to accumulate savings, in order to have their own houses, get involved in ventures, spend money on one another, and build their lives. No conclave of state experts, regardless of their brilliant capabilities, can be compared with the clever mechanism of the market, which both absorbs and disperses the wisdom of millions of people, each of whom is trying to build his future in his own way.

The government has legal duties, for example ensuring the observance of contracts, the protection of the right of ownership and, the setting up of limits for permissible entrepreneurial activity. The government must lay down the rules for an honest game and create a "flat playing-field," ensuring trust and stability. When law and order is ensured in the Soviet Union, this will lead to the further involvement of foreign scientific and technical information, and foreign investments.

The United States is prepared to assist. We offer something more than loans and subsidies: We are offering our best specialist knowledge and specialists. Last year we approved the idea of granting the Soviet Union GATT observer status in order to promote the establishment of normal relations with the trading countries of the world. And in order to speed up the rate of the implementation of reforms geared to the market and your integration in the world economy, at the recently concluded meeting of the "G-7" in London it was proposed to grant the Soviet Union the special status of associate member of the IMF and the World Bank.

When I return to Washington I will submit to Congress for approval a U.S.-Soviet trade agreement which will promote an increase in the activeness of trade between our countries; we will aim to establish Most Favored Nation status in trade to the Soviet Union; and I will propose that certain restrictions, the well-known Stevenson and Byrd amendments be eliminated, so that American business circles can compete more successfully in obtaining orders for export to the Soviet Union. We are also holding talks with the aim of concluding bilateral treaties on taxes and investments—I would like it if their preparation were finished by the end of the year—in order to ensure more favorable conditions for investments in our relations, and extend our economic partnership to the utmost degree. We want to do everything we can to ensure the development of our economic cooperation in as fast a rate your reforms allow.

Freedom ensures a chance of success and creates a risk of failure. The government can act as arbiter, but this does not guarantee success. Free markets are based on impetus provided by imagination and people's creative potentials. A risk undoubtedly exists. However, success is also rewarded. Who could have foreseen that a group of college students working in a garage 15 years ago would revolutionize America's computer industry? Or that a man who 30 years ago was a refuse collector in Philadelphia would today be the head of an American firm for treating waste with a capital of \$6 billion? When

opportunities are put to use, you can be a mechanic or a millionaire, and in my country some mechanics are millionaires.

To build your own future means to create a better life. Russian values and traditions are compatible with free enterprise and they must be preserved. Look at the members of G-7—they are all industrially developed democratic countries, each of which has its own values and traditions. The culture and atmosphere of American entrepreneurship may differ from those existing in other places, but the strength of this idea is universal. It was put into practice in thousands of various ways by millions of people everywhere in the world. Those who achieve success here must not be insulted or called "speculators" or "exploiters" since that is not what they are. They are people who are filling up the shelves in your stores.

We now understand why attempts to create a "new Soviet man" were not crowned with success: because human nature cannot be destroyed and created anew. Instead of this we want to develop the strong sides of human nature in order to give the possibility to men and women to build their future, following any paths that they consider to be the best for themselves.

The idea of combining free markets and free people, and opportunities for everyone—this combination of political and economic freedom is the spirit of democratic capitalism. From every quarter, we can hear the voices of men and women who want freedom, who want to acquire the possibility of building their future by themselves and establishing closer ties between their efforts and the result. Some people call this the American dream. In reality this is a universal dream. And this is a dream which the Soviet people are now aiming to put into practice for themselves.

Every one of us can make our dream a reality. In order to create small and medium-sized enterprises, you have to find resources for earnings, involve competent men and women in the work, produce goods and services that are most needed by consumers, and improve technology and methods in order to preserve competitiveness. The principles of the free market do not boil down to a situation whereby one or two people start working and quickly become rich. It is something bigger. As President Woodrow Wilson said, "in every great entrepreneur is something of an idealist." For you and your entrepreneurs, this means dignity and self-respect, which are ensured by work. It means changing the situation in your community. And, depending on how the opportunities expand in entrepreneurship, this will mean returning hope to the people of the Soviet Union.

Your task will be hard, but it is possible that I may be able to help you with some advice. There is a story that a certain young man became the head of a company. His predecessor gave him three envelopes and advised him that if he should ever find himself in a difficult position he should open these envelopes. And one day, when

things started to go quite badly, this man decided that the time had come to open the first envelope. The following was written on the piece of paper inside: "Blame your predecessor for everything." So he did this and the situation improved for a while, but then it deteriorated again. He decided to open the second envelope. The note inside said: "Blame the accountants for everything." So he did this. However, the turnover continued to decrease. And finally, after much hesitation, he opened up the third envelope. The note said: "Prepare three envelopes."

In business there are no right or wrong formulas. I cannot tell you how to transform your country's economy in order to shift from administration and control to supply and demand by placing this information in three envelopes. You must find out which methods are the most effective for all of you and for your consumers. You must achieve a situation whereby the dreams of your people become a reality in any way you are able to do this. You must elaborate your version of democratic capitalism that corresponds to Russian culture and values.

Remember, as Tolstoy said: "Patience and work will win." In order to create free markets, you need time and patience. However, it is possible. Because everyone here today has something that cannot be bought or sold: You have the strength of the idea.

Commentator Reviews Summit Impact

LD0108195991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Interview with PRAVDA political commentator Tomas Kolesnichenko by unidentified correspondent; from the "Vremya" newscast—live or recorded]

[Text] [Kolesnichenko] You know, I do not want to use such high-sounding words or flowery epithets, but this is just what world leaders are doing now—Kohl, Reagan, Kaifu and others openly call this an historic event. This is understandable. The meetings have developed in stages. If previously it was, for example, a matter of the move away from confrontation, then the transition toward cooperation, not excluding rivalry in such areas as ideology and the military, is already a matter of partnership. You must agree that we have never had this before. Therefore, it is all unknown and new, and so the first results are important.

Of course, the main compliments have been reserved for the treaty on the reduction of offensive weapons. This is understandable, because for the first time we can breathe freely as the irreversible process of nuclear disarmament has commenced. A signal has been sounded to those nuclear countries which have these weapons and have still not reduced them—it is time for them to join in.

Regional problems, too, where previously there was no way we could think of cooperating in this area, and now, take a look—the statement on Yugoslavia, on the Middle

East. The main thing here is that we are cooperating as two great powers. This is very important.

[Correspondent] We are, of course, interested in the issue of the economic aspect of the talks. What can be said about this?

[Kolesnichenko] Well, the economy has really come to the forefront. I would even say that here is not simply a matter of economic relations, it is a question of philosophy. A choice had to be made by both. Our choice—are we going to take a firm stand on the path toward reform, toward a market economy and democratization. For them—will they peacefully and indifferently, or even gloatingly, look after us during this difficult process, or will they embark upon a path to meet us halfway. Now it is clear that in this matter, too, we are partners. What was adopted in London in principle is now already taking on definite shape and a mechanism of activity. This is very important. It is even more important than if we had received some sort of credit. Money is always necessary, but we would have now gone off into some dark hole, while if we create a market infrastructure with their assistance, then there will be both investment and help.

[Correspondent] And, briefly, about future prospects.

[Kolesnichenko] Prospects are very interesting, although, as you know, it is not all straightforward. There are contradictions and even obstacles of some sort. Generally speaking, Bush spoke of them in his speech at the Foreign Relations Institute but diplomacy is the art of the possible, as political figures say. I would like to say it is also what is really possible. I would like to apply these words not only to them, but to us, too. We really need them now.

Soviet, U.S. Researchers Study Ozone Layer

LD0108222691 Moscow TASS in English 1119 GMT 1 Aug 91

[By correspondent Vyacheslav Serikov]

[Text] Leningrad August 1 (TASS)—The ozone layer enveloping the Earth has been described as the planet's biological shield warding off the Sun's harsh ultra-violet radiation. Research already done by Soviet and U.S. scientists formed the basis for the work of Soviet and American researchers-members of the Earth science working group who plan joint experiments and exchange of observation data obtained in space and on the Earth's surface.

Space research done in Leningrad is justly acclaimed the world over. Starting with the first space missions, Leningrad-based space researchers launched wide-scale projects to study fundamental and applied problems of space science.

At present, scientists in the Soviet Union and other countries are most interested in studies of the Earth from space and of the atmospheric gas layers.

American researchers have accumulated considerable experience in this field. Their investigations in the Antarctic have revealed that the ozone ring's thickness is not uniform. The Antarctic is the continent of ozone holes, caused by the circumpolar air current influencing the distribution of near-Earth gasses.

Soviet scientists, for their part, have reached a conclusion that the atmosphere is mainly ruptured over the spacecraft launching sites. But these local holes are insubstantial and are soon filled.

Joint research in this field has provided the basis for the creation of the Soviet-American on-board instruments and decoding methods and for conducting a number of satellite-related experiments.

"Consequences of Iraq's arson with regard to Kuwait's oil wells were also considered by specialists in space research," the Soviet-American working group's leader, Professor Anatoliy Buznikov told TASS.

"Together with American colleagues, we have been watching from space the movement of the smoke and carbon dioxide tails [as received]. On the basis of these observations we supply recommendations to areas towards which the toxic cloud is moving."

In addition to ecologic observations, specialists from the two countries are working in the field of space instrument making, astronomy, astrophysics, biology and medicine. The results of their efforts are stored in a data bank accessible to Soviet and U.S. researchers.

Northeast Asia

Three Japanese Boats Violate Sea Border

OW0208024691 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1710 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] As IF [INTERFAX] learned at the Pacific sea border protection headquarters, three Japanese boats have violated the Soviet sea border in July. The boat "Tatsumi-Mar-21" was detained July 16, two others—"Kakusei-Mar-1" and "Katobuki-Mar-58" on July 26. Each boat carried nearly a ton of sea products.

The Prosecutor's Office of the village of the Yuzhno-Kurilsk has instituted legal proceedings against the first boat on charges of a violation of the Soviet state border and illegal fishery on the Soviet territory. Cases of the other two are currently under consideration.

Fourth Schooner Confiscated

PM0108134691 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 30 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

[Report from "News Service: Army and Navy" column: "No Fish, No Schooners. Keep Out of Our Zone"]

[Text] The Japanese fishing schooner Nisshin Maru 51 was detained by a Pacific Border District ship for illegal fishing not far from Shikotan island.

The poachers were found to have 155 tonnes of salmon on board. A preliminary expert analysis established that the damage to our natural resources is on the order of half a million foreign currency rubles. And that is not the first incursion into our 200-mile economic zone by fishermen from the Land of the Rising Sun.

The illegal catch and the schooner were confiscated.

USSR Is 'Rightful Owner' of Kurils

PM0108143791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 26 Jul 91 First Edition p 3

[Report by Major M. Moskvina: "Seeking the Truth in Archives"]

[Text] Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk—Despite the improvement in Soviet-Japanese relations, passions surrounding the Kuril Islands are not abating. This is probably the reason why the people of Sakhalin are showing such interest in attending the lectures that K. Cherevko, scientific associate of the Institute of the History of the USSR and one of the authors of the "Russian Pacific Epic," is currently delivering in the oblast center. He cites weighty evidence for his claim that Russia is the rightful owner of the chain. Including the lists compiled by D. Shabalin of about 1,500 Kuril residents (Ainu) who voluntarily became Russian subjects in 1778. Cherevko's archive also includes an interesting picture from a Japanese scientific work that is clearly not intended for "Russian eyes." It shows the Japanese, having pulled down an Orthodox cross, installing their own "distinguishing" marks on Iturup. Cherevko ferreted out many facts during his 5 years working in Japan.

Silayev To Visit Japan 17-24 Aug

OW0208062191 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1430 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Chairman of the Russian Council of Ministers Ivan Silayev received the Japan Ambassador Extraordinary to the USSR S. Edamura in Moscow on Thursday. An "IF" [INTERFAX] correspondent was informed about it in the information Department of Russian Council of Ministers. The problems of the future visit of the Russian governmental delegation headed by Ivan Silayev to Japan were discussed in the meeting. The visit is scheduled on August, 17-24.

Moscow-DPRK Economic Cooperation Discussed*SK0108141591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean
1330 GMT 29 Jul 91*

[From "Various Aspects of Cooperation" program]

[Text] The USSR and the DPRK have been cooperating for many years in the economic fields. For example, both sides are jointly participating in timber production in the USSR's far east.

The forestry cooperation agreement between the two governments expired last year. At a Soviet cabinet meeting held some time ago, the signing of a new agreement was discussed.

According to the summation of the meeting, a relevant instruction was announced. I would like to introduce some of its main points to you now.

In connection with the expiration of the Soviet-Korean intergovernmental agreement, the Korean side has asked the USSR to let it to continue timber production on Soviet territory.

Taking this into consideration, the Soviet cabinet has supported the proposal expounded by the Russian cabinet, the Khabarovsk executive committee in Primorsky Krai, and the state executive committee in Amur for extending cooperation with Korea in this field from 1991 to 1993.

The Russian cabinet will hold talks and sign relevant agreements with the Korean side. One of the basic conditions of cooperation is that the Korean side participate in establishing the joint enterprise for timber production in the area in order to produce wood, fiber board, furniture, lumber, and necessities.

It was said at the Soviet cabinet instruction that the Soviet customs committee was authorized to guarantee a free supply of pharmaceutical, food stuff, and cloth from the DPRK for the Korean residents working in the USSR and to allow them to freely take their share of lumber production into the DPRK.

A favorable situation has been created in the cooperation of the two countries in light industry. An agreement on cooperation in this field was reached in 1986. The two countries continue to cooperate according to the intergovernmental agreement which is valid until 2000.

In connection with unfavorable situation concerning the guarantee of raw materials in the Soviet light industrial enterprises in 1990 and with a new method of fulfilling the settlement between the USSR and the DPRK, the Soviet light industrial enterprises regrettably had to reduce the amount of raw materials to the DPRK, except for their finished products.

IZVESTIYA published an article on this. The Soviet state light industrial committee continually checks the Soviet fulfillment of its obligation in accordance with the intergovernmental agreement. We are taking appropriate

steps to solve problems that may occur when the DPRK light industrial enterprises provide raw materials. (Adomaizes), vice chairman of a committee, said this in a press interview.

IZVESTIYA said that the Soviet state light industrial committee is pushing ahead with the work to examine some articles of the agreement aimed at keeping cooperation with the DPRK in order to provide the Soviet consumer market with sewing products.

I have talked about a part of the Soviet-Korean economic cooperation.

DPRK Relations Experience Transition*LD0208045991 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service
in English 2210 GMT 1 Aug 91*

[Text] The Soviet Union's relations with North Korea: Both countries marked recently 30 years of their bilateral friendship agreement amid widespread attention to how Moscow and Pyongyang were building their relations. The government and the press are often wide apart on the issue, but what do the experts make of the prospects of bilateral contacts? To find out, our reporter interviewed (Oleg Davydov), a political scientist of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Diplomatic Academy.

(Oleg Davydov) spoke of recession in relations with North Korea against the backdrop of improving relations with South Korea, adding that Pyongyang's response to a recent exchange of embassies between Moscow and Seoul was very negative. In his view, there has been a realignment of the whole pattern of relations with the Korean Peninsula after decades of military-political confrontation with the United States in which North Korea was seen as the Soviet Union's important ally in the Far East. He said military, strategic, and ideological factors which used to stiffen relations between the two countries were on the wane. Although military cooperation is still being kept up, said Mr. (Davydov), it's role will diminish as regional tensions go down. He spoke of the need to maintain stable relations with the neighboring country in the absence of a reliable regional security system.

Allied relations with North Korea help counterbalance the military alliance between Washington and Seoul, being part of the existing balance of forces in the region. Mr. (Davydov) said bilateral relations help maintain regional peace and security and that the Soviet Union is the only superpower having diplomatic relations both with Pyongyang and Seoul. This, in itself, says Mr. (Davydov), deters North Korea's isolation from the rest of the world and helps towards greater stability and [word indistinct] in relations between the two Koreas and on the Peninsula as a whole.

In conclusion, (Oleg Davydov) said relations between the Soviet Union and North Korea were going through a painful stage of transition from a purely military and

ideological alliance to political and economic cooperation, with national interests on both sides being taken into account. He said that the movement towards this goal wouldn't be an easy one and much would depend on whether or not the sides would be able to refrain from recrimination before passing over to new patterns of cooperation in line with their interests and political realities of today.

Politician Speaks at Diplomatic Academy

91P50263A Moscow *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA*
in Russian 25 Jul 91 p 3

[Report by Igor Titov; "Lecture by a South Korean Politician"]

[Text] Just a few years ago, the USSR Foreign Ministry Diplomatic Academy was a closed, almost secret, institution. There was no sign on its building; the Soviet press did not write about it.

Fortunately, times have changed. Not only is the academy no longer concealed from foreigners, but they are courteously invited as honored guests.

Kim Yun-hwan, secretary-general of the ruling Democratic Liberal Party of the Republic of Korea, spoke before students of the academy and also scholars, journalists, and public leaders the day before yesterday. His lecture was full of interesting facts and innovative ideas.

From my viewpoint, the parallel which the South Korean political leader drew between our perestroika and the democratization process in the southern part of the Korean Peninsula was original. He emphasized that in the summer of 1987, South Korea broke away from an authoritarian system and that the Soviet Union is now going through a similar stage. A mutually complementary process has begun. The revitalization of foreign and domestic policies of the USSR has made it possible for Korea to change its attitude towards our country and for the Soviet Union to recognize South Korea as a partner in the creation of a new world order in Asia.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentary Views New ASEAN Objectives

91UF1026A Moscow *PRAVDA* in Russian
27 Jul 91 Second Edition p 7

[Article by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov; "View From Moscow: Overcoming Alienation"]

[Text] This summer has enriched the world political vocabulary with new concepts. The "big seven" for the first time timed their meeting to coincide with a discussion with the president of the USSR in London. But, in addition to the "seven plus one" formula, which hardly needs explaining, one other was born in July: "(six plus seven plus two)." The annual meeting of the six foreign ministers of the ASEAN (Indonesia, the Philippines,

Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, and Brunei) and also their traditional meeting with the seven "dialogue partners" (the United States, Canada, Japan, South Korea, Australia, New Zealand, and the EEC) were held in accordance with this arrangement in the Malaysian capital. In addition, the USSR and the PRC were represented for the first time in Kuala Lumpur on this occasion (true, "outside the parentheses," as it were, that is, as guests).

Neither Moscow nor Beijing had previously had direct contacts with ASEAN as a regional community. It is noteworthy, therefore, that the Soviet delegation in the Malaysian capital was headed by a deputy prime minister, and the Chinese delegation, by the foreign minister.

The meetings in London and Kuala Lumpur are not comparable, of course. If only because the first was held at the top level, the second, at ministerial level. But both said events embody a characteristic sign of our times. In politics, the surmounting of alienation, in economics, the gravitation toward integration. Both the first and the second engender the need for a regular character to be imparted to the contacts and for permanent mechanisms of interaction to be created for this.

The impetus to the surmounting of alienation was provided by Europe. Once the main area of military confrontation, it became the home of the Helsinki process, whose range has exceeded the "from the Atlantic to the Urals" geographical framework. In the colorful expression of U.S. Secretary of State Baker, there is in fact a Euro-Atlantic community "from Vancouver to Vladivostok." If the CSCE process created conditions conducive to East-West political dialogue, the invitation of President Gorbachev to London affords qualitatively new opportunities for the "big seven's" economic interaction with the Soviet Union and for its organic incorporation in the common system of world-economic relations.

All this served as a boost to similar trends in the Asia-Pacific region—the part of our planet which is developing the most dynamically—also. The optimum mode of regular discussion of regional problems on a multilateral basis has long been sought there. The current form of the exchange of opinions has been employed: annual meetings of the ASEAN foreign ministers. Meetings with the heads of the foreign policy departments of the United States, Japan, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and an EEC representative have been timed to coincide with them since the mid-1970's. The list of participants in these discussions is strictly limited. South Korea, for example, has now for the first time become a full "dialogue partner" after 12 years of waiting. The question of the USSR and the PRC being accorded such status has yet to be decided. But it has been announced officially that the next ASEAN meeting, which will be held next summer in Manila, will once again take place with Soviet and Chinese participation.

The fact that ASEAN has begun to invite the USSR and the PRC to its annual meetings is notable for many reasons. I believe that it is not only the general warming of the international climate which has been a factor here. The changes that have occurred in the world since the "cold war" have been reflected also: on the one hand, the disintegration of the socialist community in East Europe and the difficulties of perestroika in the USSR; on the other, the victorious Blitzkrieg in the Persian Gulf, the key part in which was played by the armed forces of the United States.

For many years the unifying factor for the Southeast Asian states was fear of "communist expansion." It was initially embodied by the Soviet Union, then China, and as of the start of the present conflict in Cambodia, by Vietnam. The American military presence in the region was under such conditions a desirable balancer. But Moscow proved its devotion to the new political thinking, ended its confrontation with Washington and normalized relations with Beijing. Conditions have taken shape in which the leading world powers are no longer confronting one another in regional conflicts but interacting in their settlement.

Thanks to all this, such worldwide processes as the surmounting of alienation, in politics, and the gravitation toward integration, in economics, began to spread to the Asia-Pacific region also. But recent events have engendered other misgivings there also: lest Washington's recent military laurels and Moscow's economic disarray make the United States the world's sole superpower prepared to act as judge and jury everywhere. It seems to me that it is a prospect which prompted the Southeast Asian states, first, to reconsider its negative attitude toward a stimulation of Japan's political role in the region and, second, take a step in the direction of accommodating the USSR and the PRC in order to balance the inordinate influence of the United States. A negative attitude toward all initiatives of Tokyo has been replaced by calls on the Land of the Rising Sun to become the leader of an East Asian economic grouping which Malaysia proposes be created as a counterweight to the free trade zones being formed on both sides of the Atlantic. On the other hand, it was the U.S. secretary of state who adopted a guarded attitude toward the participation of representatives of Moscow and Beijing in the ASEAN dialogues.

As far as the Soviet Union and China are concerned, their appearance at the regional forum is particularly notable because the most painful problem for ASEAN has always been the civil war in Cambodia. As is well known, Moscow and Beijing have supported the contending parties therein. And now, having joined efforts, the two great socialist states are interacting constructively both on a Cambodian settlement and in a lowering of tension on the Korean peninsula.

It is notable that, comparing the results of London and Kuala Lumpur, the Japanese newspaper SANKEI

SHIMBUN advocated the invitation to the annual meetings of the "big seven" not only of the Soviet but also of the Chinese leader for the USSR and the PRC play a most important part for the Euro-Atlantic and for the Asia-Pacific regions. I believe this to be a reasonable idea. After all, the new world order requires the complete removal of the barriers of interregional alienation and the creation of a single space of cooperation and security embodying the wholeness and interdependence of the modern world.

Although the main purpose of the creation of ASEAN 24 years ago was economic cooperation, the association's members decided unofficially on this occasion to discuss the region's political problems also. The need arose for the concerted analysis of the changes brought about by the end of the "cold war," the reduction in the American and Soviet military presence in the Asia-Pacific region, the prospect of national reconciliation in Cambodia and the enhancement of Japan's role in Asia. It was the Japanese foreign minister, incidentally, who proposed in Kuala Lumpur that the annual meetings of the ASEAN members with their "dialogue partners" be used to discuss problems of security and, in addition, the creation of a working group for a regular exchange of opinions in this sphere in order to make the discussion at ministerial level more effective. Whereas the first part of this proposal was supported, the idea of a permanent consultative body for security problems was greeted with caution by certain participants.

I believe that there are no grounds for apprehension here. If the annual ASEAN meetings become truly open to all interested Asia-Pacific states, this will permit fruitful discussion at meetings of both the problem of regional cooperation and the problem of regional security. And then creating some special forum for the sake of the latter will hardly be necessary.

Rogachev Optimistic on Cambodian Settlement

LD3007195191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1452 GMT 30 Jul 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow, 30 July, (TASS)—There are more grounds for optimism with regard to the prospects for a settlement to the Cambodian problem, though it will take some time, USSR deputy foreign minister Igor Rogachev believes. He was taking part in a meeting of the co-chairmen of the Paris conference on Cambodia, representing the five permanent member countries of the UN Council of Security on Cambodia, which recently concluded in Beijing.

Interviewed by a TASS correspondent, Igor Rogachev noted that the work of the meeting was "rather fruitful". In his opinion they managed to achieve "good specific results which will make it possible to come closer to the stage of conducting the final part of the Paris peace conference on Cambodia."

The PRC's constructive position had a positive influence on its results, Igor Rogachev believes. "We highly value the role played by our Chinese colleagues during the preparation and holding of the meeting of 'the five'," he stressed.

Igor Rogachev also spoke about bilateral meetings with Prince Norodom Sihanouk and Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen, which took place in Beijing. Prince Sihanouk was handed a personal message from USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, which contained the Soviet side's reply to the request to send a USSR representative to the headquarters of the Supreme National Council which opens in Phnom Penh in November this year. In Rogachev's words, "the essence of the answer lies in a benevolent attitude to this request."

Conversations with the head of the Cambodian government were devoted to the discussion of prospects for the further development of bilateral cooperation. "Today we can say confidently", Igor Rogachev stated, "that we will have good relations with this country even after new state structures are created there."

Speaking about the Beijing meeting as a whole, the USSR deputy foreign minister stressed its importance as, in his opinion, "today the Cambodian settlement is entering its final stage."

Near East & South Asia

Bush Calls on Israel, Palestinians To Negotiate

PM0108151191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
27 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

["IZVESTIYA Press Service" report: "G. Bush Appeals to Israel and Palestinians"]

[Text] U.S. President G. Bush has called on Israel and the Palestinians "not to miss the historic opportunity" to achieve progress toward a peaceful settlement in the Near East conflict.

Speaking to a meeting of Christians of the Antioch Orthodox Church, he emphasized that no one can impose a solution that is not acceptable to the parties to the conflict themselves. Having called on Israel to "respond positively" to the American proposals to convene a peace conference, the U.S. President also addressed the Palestinians: "I would ask them to do everything possible to take advantage of this unprecedented opportunity to achieve the implementation of their legitimate rights and at the same time advance the cause of peace."

The main problem along the road to the conference is still the question of Palestinian representation. Israel categorically refuses to participate in talks if Palestinians from East Jerusalem are represented at them. PLO Executive Committee Chairman Y. 'Arafat reported the other day that U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker had agreed

to this Israeli demand—at least so far as the conference's first stage is concerned. Explaining the U.S. position, an administration spokesman told journalists that from Washington's point of view it would be expedient to avoid discussing Jerusalem's status during the initial stage of the talks, because this is the "most difficult question." As is well known, Israel annexed East Jerusalem and declared the city to be its indivisible capital for all time.

However, there are also other problems which complicate convening the conference. For example, Syrian Foreign Minister F. al-Shar' stated Thursday that his country had received assurances from the United States that Israel will release all the territories occupied by it in 1967, including the Syrian Golan Heights.

However, Prime Minister Y. Shamir has emphasized that Israel will never leave not only the the Golan Heights but also the other lands.

Interview With Belonogov on Gulf Crisis Results

OW0208081991 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1430 GMT 1 Aug 91

[By Petr Vassilyev, diplomatic correspondent, from "Diplomatic Panorama," following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "The possibility of convening a peace conference on the Middle East figured prominently at the Moscow summit," USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksander Belonogov said. In an interview to DP [Diplomatic Panorama] he welcomed the wish to settle the conflict in that region, confirmed by the Soviet and American presidents, as well as their joint statement on the Middle East.

At the current stage, much depends on the efforts which the USSR and the U.S., as the states co-chairing the peace conference on the Middle East settlement, will make to convene it next October.

Speaking, among other things, about the anniversary of the armed conflict in the Persian Gulf (Iraq occupied Kuwait on August 2), Aleksandr Belonogov noted that from the moment the conflict flared up to its end, the Soviet side pursued the correct and the only possible policy.

"Looking back a year after," he said, "I can see no situation in which we should have acted differently."

Aleksandr Belonogov enumerated several lessons which could be taken from the Gulf war.

In the first place he noted that the current level of interaction and mutual understanding in the world community will no longer allow anyone to reckon on successful use of force against any other sovereign state. Besides that, the Gulf war demonstrated an increased role of the UN. He said that for decades the United Nations' efficiency had been paralysed by some of its

members' ideological approach to world affairs, particularly by East-West confrontation and rivalry between the Soviet Union and the U.S.

It is obvious that the new type of relations between the USSR and the U.S., and also between the USSR and Western Europe has radically changed the alignment of forces in the UN and revealed new, hitherto unused possibilities of cooperation.

In this connection the Soviet diplomat underscored the importance of interaction between the five permanent members of the Security Council.

The third lesson which the world community should take is greater "transparency in arms trade and, above all, abstention from sending arms to explosive regions with unsettled conflicts," Aleksandr Belonogov said.

The determination of the Security Council's five permanent members to check the spreading of nuclear and missile technology came about as a direct consequence of the Gulf crisis.

"Another vitally important lesson is that we should learn to untangle conflicts timely and prevent the transformation of conflicts into wars," Aleksandr Belonogov noted.

Touching upon the nuclear facilities in Iraq, the Soviet diplomat stated with regret that the actual scope of Baghdad's nuclear activity far outpassed the officially declared one. "The recently revealed additional facts do not build up trust in the government of Iraq," he said. "We proceed from the belief that having committed itself to strictly observe Resolution 687 of the UN Security Council Baghdad will not conceal anything from the inspection groups and will cooperate honestly with the UN and the International Atomic Agency."

Only such a course "will create the situation whereby the world community will be able to reconsider the economic limitations put on Iraq," Aleksandr Belonogov said.

The second circumstance which naturally arouses great concern is the scope of Iraq's activity to equip its armed forces with chemical weapons. The Soviet diplomat said that Baghdad had understated four times figures on the amount of this type of weapons of mass destruction available in Iraq.

Aleksandr Belonogov also spoke about the possibility of allowing Iraq to resume its oil exports for restoring its war-ruined economy and buying food and medicines. "Everyone should understand what enormous sufferings befell the Iraqi people," he said. "But the cause of these sufferings is Baghdad's thoughtless and adventurist policy. Conscientious cooperation between Baghdad and the UN will allow the Iraqi people to concentrate on the restoration of what was ruined by the war."

In conclusion, Aleksandr Belonogov expressed his views on the tragic incident in Lithuania—the murder of six

people at a customs post. "The incident is being investigated," he said. "I'm sure all possible versions will be tested. In the meantime, I wouldn't make hasty conclusions."

"However, my personal opinion is and I am under the impression that there is a definite link between the tragic incident and the efforts of definite forces to dramatise the situation in the Baltic republics and thus complicate the talks between the USSR and the U.S. which were then held in Moscow."

Dalai Lama Leaves Moscow for New Delhi

LD3107132791 Moscow TASS in English 0628 GMT 31 Jul 91

[By correspondent Kim Boldokhonov]

[Text] Moscow July 31 TASS—Tenzin Gyatso, Dalai Lama XIV, Nobel Prize winner, left here for New Delhi on Tuesday.

At the Sheremetyevo airport the Dalai Lama was seen off by Moscow Buddhists, representatives of international and Soviet public organisation and senior officials of the central Buddhist board of the USSR.

During his three-week stay in the Soviet Union on the occasion of the celebration of the 250th anniversary of the recognition of Buddhism in Russia, the dalai lama visited Moscow, the Buryat republic, the Aginsky Buryat autonomous district, and the Kalmyk republic, where the indigenous population profess Buddhism.

Wherever the Dalai Lama went, he was accorded exceptionally warm welcome.

Commentary Views Talks on Afghan Problem

TA0108190991 Moscow Radio Moscow in Dari to Afghanistan 1500 GMT 31 Jul 91

[Commentary by Yuriy Andreyev]

[Text] Dear listeners, the two-day talks of main Afghan mojahedin groups with the participation of the Iranian and Pakistani foreign ministers ended in Islamabad. Our commentator, Yuriy Andreyev, writes on the details of these talks:

In recent days Islamabad was transformed into the center of tumultuous political developments on the Afghan problem. Intensive political consultations, in which the situation in Afghanistan was discussed in detail, were held in the Pakistani capital. Iranian Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati, his Pakistani counterpart Akram Zaki, and leaders of the largest Afghan mojahedin groups, which represented the Sunni and Shiite opposition factions, took part in these consultations. As has been reported, Kabul's representative was not present at the talks, but Benan Sevan, the UN secretary general's envoy, defended his interests.

According to news agency reports, the issue of forming a coalition broad-based government in Kabul was the focus of the Islamabad talks. At the same time, it was proposed that the UN peace plan on Afghanistan, which reportedly consists of five points, be accepted as the main basis of a potential compromise. The proposal on forming an interim government in Kabul in which the representatives of Afghanistan's Watan Party, commanders of mojahedin groups, former activists of Zaher Shah's regime, and some of the leaders of opposition groups based in Iran would be included is one of the key elements of this plan.

Thus, the resolution of the Afghan problem by political methods, on the basis of a logical compromise, and by taking into consideration the interests of all the parties involved in the conflict has been advocated. But changes were introduced to the UN peace plan at the Islamabad talks. The document on the outcome of these talks, titled the jihad of the Afghan people against foreign occupation, contains two contradictory clauses.

On one hand, the participants agreed on holding political consultations in Pakistan on the basis of the UN plan's broad outlines. Moreover, according to IRNA, support was expressed for a political solution of this problem rather than a military solution. On the other hand, the statement released on the results of these meetings, as before, negates the participation of Afghanistan's current officials in the coalition government.

Naturally, one has to deduce that such an attitude is only a political maneuver, or in other words the mojahedin, who have accepted in principle the UN plan for resolving the Afghan problem, have left room for themselves to bargain with the Kabul regime. If this is the case, the opposition will have to hold contact with Najibollah's government soon.

The other option, however, cannot be ruled out. That option is that this time, too, the mojahedin were not able to overcome their hatred of and indignation at the Kabul leadership. In this case, the process of solving the Afghan problem will again face numerous difficulties. The coming few months will show whether common sense can triumph over emotions.

Naval Squadron Visits Syria

LD3107134691 Moscow TASS in English 0616 GMT
31 Jul 91

[By correspondent Anatoly Bogdanov]

[Text] Damascus July 31 TASS—A Soviet naval squadron, led by Rear Admiral P.G. Svyatashov, commander of the Mediterranean squadron, has arrived in the Syrian port of Tartus.

They played host to a group of Syrian senior naval officers and members of the general public who with lively interest familiarised themselves with the everyday

living conditions of the crews of Soviet combatant ships that keep vigil far away from their native land.

Syrian officers, many of whom had studied in Soviet higher naval educational establishments and academies, highly appreciated the combat training standards of their Soviet counterparts. They spoke warmly of the days of their studies in the Soviet Union and favoured stronger Soviet-Syrian friendship and the development of good relations between the armies of the two countries in the name of ensuring peace and security throughout the world.

In conclusion of the meeting Soviet navymen gave a concert that had been rehearsed for the guests by amateur performers from among seamen. They expressed a wish that such meetings on the hospitable Syrian soil become a good tradition.

East Europe

Yugoslavia's Markovic Arrives in Moscow for Visit

Commentary Examines Visit

LD0108123791 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0830 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Commentary by international observer Vladimir Shel'epin]

[Text] [No dateline as received] Ante Markovic, Chairman of the Federal Executive Council of Yugoslavia, is arriving on a visit to Moscow today at the invitation of Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov. Head of the Federal Government of friendly Yugoslavia is arriving in the Soviet Union at a complex—one could say dramatic—moment for his country. Every day the telegraph brings reports of bloody clashes in different regions of Croatia, of people dying. One can assume, therefore, that political issues will be given more attention at the Moscow talks than during the Soviet Prime Minister's June visit to the SFRY when difficult and somewhat alarming economic aspects of our mutual relations were thoroughly discussed.

The crisis that has struck the Yugoslav Federation profoundly worries Soviet people not only because blood is being spilt and a threat to the peace and stability in the Balkans and all of Europe is emerging, but also because we are not safeguarded against a similar situation, either. Reports from Armenia and Azerbaijan, South Ossetia and, especially, yesterday's report from Lithuania show how tragic the consequences of excessive cruelty and reluctance to make concessions in relations between peoples and republics, which for years have peacefully coexisted, can be.

On the eve of Markovic's departure, the world's press voiced much conjecture about what Mikhail Gorbachev would say to him after discussing the Yugoslav crisis with the U.S. President. Mention was made of Moscow's

one-sided support for the central leadership in Belgrade, unlike the more flexible stance in Washington, which has recently begun to insist less on preserving the federation's integrity. However, the content of the joint Soviet-American statement on Yugoslavia adopted by the two leaders is already known today. It dots many i's.

Both sides have emphasised the need for everyone involved in the conflict to respect the fundamental principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act and the Paris Charter for a new Europe. These documents, as is known, contain clauses both on the impermissibility of using violence to alter the postwar territorial structure of Europe and on the right of all peoples to self-determination. But one of the leitmotifs of the whole all-European process is unswerving observance of the rights and basic freedoms of the individual, wherever he lives and whatever nation he belongs to.

The USSR and the United States have supported the efforts being made by the countries participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and, specifically, by the European Community (EC), to settle the problem. Incidentally, on Monday, the EC foreign ministers adopted in Brussels a new package of measures, which includes, in particular, increasing the size of the EC observer mission and extending its mandate to Croatia. It has been announced that a Community delegation will shortly arrive in Belgrade to hold further talks.

Unfortunately, the mediatory efforts, of which there have already been quite a few, have so far provided no tangible results. Markovic was evidently right when he declared, on his return from Brussels, that Yugoslavia must settle its own problems itself. The joint Soviet-American document also stresses that a solution to the various problems must be found by the peoples of Yugoslavia themselves—on the basis, moreover, of democratic principles and through peace talks and constructive dialogue.

And so concern over the dramatic development of the situation in Yugoslavia, and the call to avoid the use of force and to observe the cease-fire accord, have again been issued from Moscow—this time from the mouths of the highest representatives of the two superpowers, as they used to be called not so long ago, which do, moreover, have long-standing and good relations with that country.

During his visit, Ante Markovic will be able once again to appreciate the Soviet people's sincere liking for all the peoples of Yugoslavia. One wants to hope that that support will help him in further efforts to restore peace in his unfortunate homeland.

Arrival Noted

LD0108112291 Moscow TASS in English 1105 GMT
1 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—Prime Minister Ante Markovic of Yugoslavia arrived in the Soviet Union

today on a two-day working visit. In the afternoon, he is scheduled to have talks with Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov. The Yugoslav premier is also expected to meet with Russian President Boris Yeltsin.

Soviet-Yugoslav talks will focus on the situation in Yugoslavia and bilateral cooperation in the economic and political spheres, TASS learned at the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

The results of the visit will be summed up by Pavlov and Markovic at a joint news conference on Friday.

Meets With Gorbachev

LD0208103391 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service
in Serbo-Croatian 0950 GMT 2 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow, 2 Aug (TANJUG)—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev received SFRY Federal Executive Council President Ante Markovic in the Kremlin today. Markovic arrived in Moscow yesterday for a brief visit.

Prior to his meeting with Markovic, the Soviet head of state said during a brief meeting with a group of Yugoslav correspondents that the USSR supports a peaceful solution to the Yugoslav crisis and Yugoslavia's integrity.

"Your country's problems are close to the Soviet Union. Your peoples and your country are close to us," said the Soviet head of state.

He welcomed Ante Markovic's arrival in Moscow, saying that it will present an opportunity for him to be informed firsthand about the events in Yugoslavia.

Aleksandar Mirkovic, vice president of the Federal Executive Council, and Yugoslav Ambassador in Moscow Andjelko Runjic are also present at the talks with Gorbachev.

Meets With Pavlov

PM0208102591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Aug 91 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Soviet-Yugoslav Talks"]

[Text] On 1 August talks took place between USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov and A. Markovic, president of the SFRY Federal Executive Council, who has come to Moscow on a working visit.

The chairman of the Yugoslav Government provided detailed information on the situation which is taking shape in the SFRY and the efforts of the federal bodies in the search for ways of setting up constructive dialogue in the country and for resolving Yugoslav problems in a peaceful, democratic way.

The USSR prime minister confirmed the Soviet Union's position in support of Yugoslavia's integrity. It was emphasized that the Soviet Union advocates the creation of external and internal conditions which would

enable the Yugoslav peoples to resolve themselves by peaceful, democratic, constructive means, the question of the SFRY's future state structure.

The sides were unanimous in the view that international efforts aimed at the stabilization of the situation in Yugoslavia should not contradict the principle of noninterference in internal affairs. They noted that the statement of the session of the council of foreign ministers of the CSCE countries in Berlin retains its importance and should be observed by everyone.

A. Markovic assessed highly the Soviet Union's position and moral-political and diplomatic support for the federal government's efforts to stabilize the situation in the country and to preserve Yugoslavia's unity and territorial integrity.

There was also a discussion of the state and development prospects of Soviet-Yugoslav trade and economic cooperation and the main avenues were defined for the application of joint efforts in finding ways of overcoming the difficulties arising in this field.

The sides expressed the readiness to continue to develop and expand Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation in all fields and to build up political dialogue at all levels.

The talks between V.S. Pavlov and A. Markovic took place in the friendly businesslike atmosphere characteristic of Soviet-Yugoslav relations. Taking part in them were K.F. Katushev, Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy, Yu.S. Moskovskiy, A. Mitrovic, deputy president of the SFRY Federal Executive Council, M. Maksic, SFRY first deputy federal secretary for foreign affairs, and A. Runjic, SFRY ambassador to the USSR.

Further on Pavlov Talks

LD0108190791 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT
1 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov had negotiations here today with President of the Federal Executive Council of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Ante Markovic, who arrived in Moscow for a working visit.

The head of the Yugoslav Government spoke in detail about the situation shaping in Yugoslavia, about the efforts of federal bodies in the quest for ways of starting a constructive dialogue and for a peaceful democratic solution to Yugoslav problems.

The Soviet prime minister confirmed the Soviet stand in support of Yugoslavia's integrity. It was emphasised that the Soviet Union is for creating internal and external conditions that would enable the peoples of Yugoslavia to make a decision on Yugoslavia's future social structure in a peaceful, democratic constitutional way.

The sides were united in the view that international efforts aimed at the stabilisation of the situation in Yugoslavia should not run counter to the principle of

noninterference in internal affairs. They noted that the statement of the Berlin meeting of the council of foreign ministers of the countries participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) remains valid and should be observed by everyone.

Markovic spoke highly of the Soviet Union's constructive stand and of its moral, political and diplomatic support for the Federal Government's efforts to stabilise the situation in the country and to preserve Yugoslavia's unity and territorial integrity.

The sides expressed the readiness to continue to develop and expand Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation in every area and to develop a political dialogue at every level.

Meets Yeltsin

LD0208122291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
in Russian 1100 GMT 2 Jul 91

[Text] A meeting between Boris Yeltsin, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic president, and Ante Markovic, chairman of the SFRY Federal Council, was held in Moscow. Answering questions from journalists, the Russian leader informed them that difficulties in Yugoslavia and Russia, which are similar in many ways, were discussed at the talks. Problems in developing direct Russian-Yugoslavian relations were also discussed.

Speaking about his position on our domestic problems, Boris Yeltsin said that the state should not be destroyed; it should be unified within common invariable borders. The state has been created by many generations of people, and to destroy it now means to take upon yourself a great responsibility to future generations, Boris Yeltsin stressed.

Discusses Direct Accords

LD0108192591 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Aug 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] In the Kremlin today a meeting was held between Yeltsin, President of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, and Prime Minister Markovic, chairman of the SFRY Federal Council. The talks took place in a warm atmosphere of mutual understanding. [video shows Yeltsin and Markovic in talks]

[Begin Yeltsin recording] We have reached the conclusion that we need to conclude direct agreements between Yugoslavia and the Russian Federation. [end recording]

Prime Minister Markovic noted the openness of the talks and expressed the hope for successful cooperation in the future.

Views SFRY With Yeltsin

LD0108202291 Belgrade TANJUG in English
011917 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow, August 1 (TANJUG)—President of the Russian Federation Boris Yeltsin urged the preservation of Yugoslavia's unity and territorial integrity at a press conference held after his meeting with Yugoslav Prime Minister Ante Markovic here today.

Yeltsin said he believed the Yugoslav crisis would be overcome and that the awareness would prevail that the state should not be destroyed, that Yugoslavia should remain one state within integral borders.

Generations of people have built Yugoslavia, and those who want to destroy it are taking upon them vast responsibility before the future generations, he added.

After his meeting with Markovic, Yeltsin said that Russia would continue to cooperate with Yugoslavia as a whole. He supported the Yugoslav Government programme on the functioning of the federation in the 90-day transition period, which he said was too short for stabilizing relations in the country.

Markovic, who arrived earlier today on a working visit to the Soviet Union, is expected to be received by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev tomorrow.

Yeltsin Comments

OW0208024891 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1830 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Upon meeting in the Kremlin with Yugoslavia's Premier Ante Markovic who is in the USSR on an official visit Boris Yeltsin told the journalists on Thursday that the two countries suffer similar difficulties. His impression is that the Yugoslav government is trying hard to carry out its stabilization programme within three months. Russia's President recalled his republic's conflicts with the central government, but pointed out that both sides met each other half way since they understood they had to stay in the Union.

Boris Yeltsin expressed hope that Yugoslavia's republics would come to the same conclusion—that they can't break up their state. "A state is built up by generations, to smash it is to take on heavy responsibility to posterity", commented Yeltsin.

Prime Minister Ante Markovic spoke out for wider direct contacts between the Russian Federation and Yugoslavia, particularly for direct cooperation between their enterprises.

Report on Support of Yugoslav Unity

OW0208082091 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1430 GMT 1 Aug 91

[By Mikhail Mayorov, diplomatic correspondent; from "Diplomatic Panorama;" following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Though the joint Soviet-American statement on Yugoslavia coordinated between M. Gorbachev and G. Bush during their talks in Moscow doesn't mention the two countries' adherence to the need to preserve Yugoslavia's unity and territorial integrity, this doesn't mean that the Soviet Union has altered its approach to that problem. Judging by conversations DP's [Diplomatic Panorama] correspondent had with officials from the Soviet Foreign Ministry's 3rd European Department and Department on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Soviet stand continues to be in keeping with the Berlin's statement of the CSCE member states.

The USSR insists that the Berlin statement should be strictly observed

As Yuriy Deryabin, chief of the department for security and cooperation in Europe, stressed, the USSR believes that all elements of the Berlin statement should be strictly adhered to. This involves the need to maintain Yugoslavia's unity and territorial integrity, establish a dialogue and refrain from using force in settling the crisis in Yugoslavia.

The observers' mission in Yugoslavia is expanding

In their joint statement that USSR and the U.S. called for supporting steps taken by the European Community with a view to resolving the Yugoslav problem. Y. Deryabin who represents the Soviet Union at the CSCE top-level officials committee sent a letter to the committee recently (see DP of July 30), expressing dissatisfaction with the way some collective agreements between the countries involved in the CSCE aimed at overcoming the crisis in Yugoslavia are carried out.

As the high-ranking Soviet diplomat told DP some of his remarks have been taken into account. On Monday they were discussed in Brussels at another conference held by the three: EC foreign ministers and Yugoslav officials. It was decided to expand the observers' mission in Yugoslavia to 200 persons. An agreement was reached that spokesmen for CSCE countries not belonging to the EC, such as Sweden, Canada and Czechoslovakia, should join the mission.

A visit to Moscow by A. Markovic

According to Soviet diplomats, during his working visit to the USSR beginning today Yugoslavia's Prime Minister A. Markovic will discuss new ways to settle the crisis in Yugoslavia. According to Soviet foreign ministry officials, the Yugoslav premier will be received by President Gorbachev.

Lithuanian Recognition Said Invalid

LD3107171791 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT
31 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 31 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman issued today the following statement:

"According to press reports, Lithuania has announced it recognises the independence of Slovenia and Croatia.

"This declaration cannot have any consequences under international law since Lithuania itself does not have a separate status under international law.

"Politically, the Lithuanian Republic authorities' action contradicts the international community's efforts to defuse the Yugoslavia crisis on a constitutional basis through a peaceful dialogue of the sides concerned and within the framework of the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia."

Bulgarian Assembly Urges New USSR Treaty

LD0208084591 Moscow TASS in English 0812 GMT
2 Aug 91

[Text] Sofia August 2 TASS—Bulgarian Foreign Minister Viktor Vylkov read out to a plenary meeting of the Bulgarian parliament on Thursday the text of a statement by the Soviet and Bulgarian foreign ministries adopted on August 1.

The statement says the sides are mutually willing to work out and sign a new inter-state treaty based on the principles of mutual trust, sovereignty, equality, non-interference in each other's internal affairs and mutual benefit.

The two foreign ministries declare that there is no need for the automatic prolongation for a new five-year term of the 1967 treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance between Bulgaria and the USSR. The statement stresses the intention to speed up work to prepare and sign a new treaty to regulate relations between the two countries.

A discussion followed. Representatives of all parliamentary factions participated. Speakers backed the draft submitted by the government, some of them indicated some negative aspects of the earlier bilateral relations. Along with this, most speakers stressed the significance for Bulgaria of its ties with the Soviet Union and pointed to the need to expedite work to prepare a new treaty.

Late at night the national assembly adopted the law on the non-prolongation of the present Bulgarian-Soviet treaty.

News Conference on Bulgarian Nuclear Station

PM0208091191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 27 Jul 91 First Edition p 2

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel A. Dolgikh: "Kozloduy: What Happened"]

[Text] A press conference has been held at the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power and Industry regarding problems linked with Bulgaria's Kozloduy nuclear electric power station [AES].

Here are the details. The station was built by Soviet specialists and fitted with our equipment. The first power unit (a VVER-440 [440 kilowatt water-cooled, water-moderated reactor]) was started up in 1974. By the beginning of this year four such units were in operation at the AES, along with a "million-watter" (a VVER-1000). The station had a total yield of 2.760 megawatts. A second "million-watter" is ready for startup. Kozloduy contributes roughly 40 percent of Bulgaria's overall power store.

It must be said that the VVER-440 units are somewhat outdated and are therefore subjected to various checks and reviews more often than the others. Not so long ago the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] conducted a routine check and, whereas the state of our stations and those in Czechoslovakia with this type of reactor satisfied this international organization's specialists, the head of the IAEA literally said the following about Kozloduy: "In that form I would not give my blessing for the station to continue to operate." I would note that it was not a question of the VVER-440 units (their state did not elicit particular complaints) but the way in which the station is run. The commission was struck by the filth, the neglect, and the poorly qualified maintenance personnel. Poor wages, housing problems, and the oppressive psychological atmosphere in which Bulgarian atomic energy workers have found themselves force them to "flee" the AES.

The IAEA's conclusion came as a bolt from the blue for many people, particularly the Bulgarian public. A movement in favor of closing the AES has been mounted in the country. All Europe is worried, moreover. Therefore at a recent IAEA sitting in London some people even demanded that the station be shut down. However, this was by no means the general opinion and in any case the people of Bulgaria and its government will have the last word.

The international community has currently decided to earmark for \$13 million for this country (specifically for Kozloduy). At least two tasks must be accomplished: The necessary work must be carried out on the VVER-440 reactors and at all the station's technical installations and the qualifications of the maintenance personnel must be raised to meet the relevant requirements. The second task is more complex. It has therefore now been decided to send foreign specialists to Kozloduy to help out. These are apparently to be representatives of the

USSR, Czechoslovakia, and the FRG, that is those countries with stations with similar reactors.

Last. It was noted at the press conference that it became clear four years ago that an abnormal situation was developing at the Kozloduy AES. The findings from our specialists' annual checks—conducted at the Bulgarian Government's request—attest to this. The leadership was given the information. These checks stopped being carried out as of 1989. Naturally, by decision of the Bulgarian leadership. It is no secret that the recent reappraisal of previous ideological and political views has somewhat changed relations between our countries. But what has ideology or politics to do with it if it is a question of technology—and by no means simple technology at that? Was Chernobyl not enough? I don't think that it was enough for our specialists to report their alarming findings to the country's leadership alone. If they saw that everything remained unchanged, they should have turned to the selfsame IAEA and spoken out in the mass media... However, as is well known, it's all very well to be wise after the event. But conclusions must still be drawn.

A. Abagyan, general director of the "Energiya" Science-and-Production Association; S. Tipikin, chief engineer at the "Zarubezhatomenergostroy" All-Union Production Association; Ye. Ignatenko, chief of the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power and Industry Administration for Information and Public Relations, and other specialists answered journalists' questions.

Claim of Romania to Ukraine Criticized

OW0208051291 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1430 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The appeal to the Supreme Councils of the USSR Ukraine and Moldova was adopted in the conference of the representatives from 9 cities and areas of the southern zone of Odessa region. The appeal condemns the Romanian Parliament's declaration where territorial claims to Ukraine are expressed (in particular to the lands of Odessa region).

"Dramatic events of the history must serve a good lesson but not infringe of freedom of the peoples of Ukraine and not stire up national enmity," went on the appeal.

Commentary on Romanian-Italian Treaty

PM0108102191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Jul 91 Union Edition p 6

[Report by V. Volodin: "Blockade Smashed—Romania on Road to the EC"]

[Text] Bucharest—A treaty on friendship between Romania and the Italian Republic has been signed in Bucharest by Italian Foreign Minister Gianni De Michelis and Romanian Foreign Minister Adrian Nastase.

Here, great significance is attached to this document, which has become the first to be signed at such a level with a West European state. Particular attention is being given to the fact that in the treaty's preamble both sides declare their nonrecognition of the "Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact". A. Nastase is of the opinion that the signing of the document testifies to Italy's desire to help Romania enter the EC.

The Italian minister, too, said that Romania's entry into the EC must be a matter of some urgency, and he noted that the treaty defines not only the nature of long-term relations between the two countries but could also serve as a basis for fruitful cooperation in the context of the changes taking place in East Europe. The minister believes that bilateral treaties with East European countries "will become the main element of European architecture."

"Rome has already signed similar treaties with Prague and Budapest. And this means that there are not two groups of East European countries," G. De Michelis announced. "Italy would like to conclude similar treaties on an equal basis with other countries, which would give us the chance to avoid a new division of Europe into opposing camps."

At a meeting with Romanian Prime Minister P. Roman, which took place after the signing of the treaty, De Michelis announced that Italy is ready to offer aid to Romanian to develop machine building, agriculture, and highway construction.

Evaluating the conclusion of the treaty, the Romanian press holds the view that the country has managed to overcome the blockade of Romania by Western countries which was prompted by last year's tragic events in Tirgu Mures and Bucharest, where clashes between rival ethnic groups and political forces led to pogroms and bloodshed. Now the conclusion of a treaty between Romania and France is on the horizon. This was announced in Bucharest after P. Roman returned from Paris, where he made an official visit a few days ago.

West Europe

Britain's Lamont Continues Visit

Meets With Gorbachev

PM0208100091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Aug 91 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting with Representative of 'Big Seven'"]

[Text] On 1 August M.S. Gorbachev met with British Chancellor of the Exchequer Norman Lamont, who under an agreement between the British prime minister and the U.S. President and in accordance with the recommendations of the "Big Seven" was in the Soviet

Union to discuss practical questions stemming from the results of the seven's meeting.

The talk was specific and frank—about the processes which are forming the conditions for a new type of economic cooperation, about the problems of a single market in the USSR, a single financial system, a common monetary and tax policy, and other infrastructures of the market economy under the conditions of a new distribution of powers on the basis of the Union Treaty which has been prepared for signing. There was talk of the ways and forms of setting up a countermovement and mutually advantageous economic collaboration for the solution of immediate, particularly urgent tasks of economic reform and in the long term—according to common “rules of play” but also with a consideration for the specific features of the Soviet economy's entry into the world economy.

The useful, thorough exchange of opinions between the president and the member of the British government representing the “Big Seven” as it were symbolized the entry into operation of the mechanism of cooperation agreed upon in London.

The interlocutors exchanged impressions of the recent Soviet-British summit meeting. The USSR president asked that his good wishes be conveyed to the prime minister, John Major, expressing the hope for good cooperation with him in the future.

V.I. Shcherbakov, N. Wicks, and D. Logan took part.

Discusses Economy

LD0108192291 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT
1 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on Thursday received British Chancellor of the Exchequer Norman Lamont.

Lamont has arrived in the Soviet Union under an agreement between Gorbachev and British Prime Minister John Major and on recommendations of the G-7 meeting in London to discuss practical issues of economic cooperation.

Gorbachev and Lamont had a frank and detailed discussion of processes that form conditions for new economic cooperation, problems of a single market, the financial system, the monetary and tax policy and other market infrastructures in the Soviet Union in accordance with the delineation of powers envisaged by a new Union treaty. They discussed ways to develop mutually beneficial economic cooperation to solve immediate, primarily urgent, and long-term tasks of the economic reform according to common rules but taking into account specific aspects of the integration of the Soviet Union into the world economy.

Gorbachev and Lamont exchanged opinions about the recent Soviet-British summit meeting. The Soviet president sent his best wishes to John Major and expressed hope that their cooperation will develop.

The meeting between Gorbachev and Lamont symbolises the setting of the mechanism of cooperation approved in London into motion.

Visits Goods Exchange

LD0108172591 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT
1 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—British Secretary of the Exchequer Norman Lamont today visited the Russian goods and raw materials exchange.

He is currently on tour around the Soviet Union under an agreement reached between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and British Prime Minister John Major at the recent negotiations in London.

Lamont arrived at the exchange by the beginning of tenders right after his meeting with Soviet First Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov and Soviet Minister of Finance Vladimir Orlov.

He listened with a professional interest to representatives of the exchange administration and asked numerous questions. Lamont was interested in details of the exchange mechanism, the staff and the procedure of the admission of broker firms into exchange members, the character of operations, the range of goods and other things.

He also showed a considerable interest in the fact that the majority of Soviet exchange staff are young people under 30 years of age. Lamont talked to one of the men—a 22-year-old broker firm employee who was described by the administration as “an average representative” of this major Soviet exchange.

The busy schedule, involving dozens of trips and meetings, including that with President Gorbachev, did not allow Lamont to devote much time to correspondents.

However, judging by his brief remarks, Lamont is satisfied with the beginning of his visit and views it as useful and substantial.

Comparison of TASS Interview

CM0208122091

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 31 July 1991 carries in its Union Edition on page 5 a report on a TASS interview with Chancellor Lamont. The IZVESTIYA item, entitled “Norman Lamont: Limitless Opportunities. Interview With British Chancellor,” has been compared with the Moscow TASS English version published in the 30 July Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 38-39 revealing the following variations:

Page 38, column one, paragraph two, sole sentence, reads ...British Chancellor of the Exchequer Norman Lamont arrives for a visit to the Soviet Union tomorrow. As is well known, the accord on this visit was reached during the recent talks in London between UK Prime Minister John Major and USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev. N. Lamont's visit to our country is the first of a series of planned visits to the USSR by finance ministers of the seven leading industrial countries. On the eve of his departure for the Soviet Union N. Lamont gave an interview to TASS correspondent Dmitriy Voskoboynikov.

Q: What is your...[picking up paragraph three, sentence one, adding passage]

Column one, paragraph six, sentence four, reads...concept of special associate status (for the Soviet Union—TASS note) at the IMF and...[rewording, adding TASS note]

Column one, paragraph six, last sentence, reads...with my visit.

Q: How would you...[picking up paragraph seven, first sentence and omitting paragraph]

Column two, paragraph two, last sentence, reads...position the better.

Q: When could you...[picking up sole sentence of paragraph eleven and omitting paragraph]

Column two, paragraph five, sentence three, reads...will be an extremely important part of that.

Q: What do you...[picking up paragraph seven, omitting paragraph six]

Column two, paragraph eight, last sentence, reads...the initial costs.

The problem of...[picking up paragraph ten, first sentence and omitting paragraph nine]

Page 39, Column one, paragraph one, sentence one, reads...it will be extremely important to settle the...[rewording];

Column one, paragraph two, sentence two, reads...more productive, uses.

Finally, of course...[picking up paragraph five, sentence one, omitting paragraphs three and four]

Column one, paragraph five, sentence two, ...Western companies, whose knowledge and experience can be harnessed...[rewording]

Same paragraph, sentence three, reads...join such ventures.

Many British companies...[picking up last paragraph, sentence one, omitting passage].

Turkish Army Chief Visits Transcaucasus

*PM0208091791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 27 Jul 91 First Edition p 2*

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Colonel V. Kaushanskiy: "Return Visit"]

[Text] Last fall a delegation from the Transcaucasus Military District headed by Colonel General V. Patrikeyev, commander of the troops of the Transcaucasus Military District, paid an official visit to Turkey. A military delegation from...[passage indistinct] of the eminent guests. They had a conversation with A. Asatiani, chairman of the Georgian Supreme Soviet, and T. Singua, chairman of the republic's government.

The delegation visited one of the district's border motorized rifle formations. The guests were familiarized with troops' living and service conditions, met servicemen's families, and attended planned field exercises.

"The subunits performed brilliantly," Army General Kh. Bayar noted. "They are easy to manage, mobile, and active, which does credit to the officers, who make maximum use of the mountains to train their subordinates. We are satisfied with the results of the visit."

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Committee Proceedings Reported

914A0995B Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
26 Jul 91 p 2

[By M. Silvanovich: "The Search for Agreement. In the Commissions of the Central Committee"]

[Text] At their meeting the members of the CPSU Central Committee Agrarian Policy Commission stated that the new program must be adopted under conditions of the multiparty system and therefore should be competitive and attractive for all strata of the population. It is scientific, but at the same time popular in its exposition of today's urgent problems. It was this postulation of the issue that, as it were, involuntarily united those who spoke in a common desire to go into the details of the problems, sometimes to the point of excess.

It was not because of chance that when summing up the debate, chairman Ye.S. Stroyev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, said that the attractiveness of the program is seen not in beautiful promises to the people about this, that, and the other. The party must take its political niche in society and not shoulder the entire anti-crisis program, including the social program, which the state structures of power are designed to execute. Nevertheless, Ye.S. Stroyev emphasized, the philosophy of a whole series of divisions does require a deepening and conciseness of formulations, but at the same time also specificity and strong principles. But in general the document may be presented for debate, during the course of which I suggest more work be done on it.

Let us deal with the statements. Their mordancy was understandable, explicable: This particular moment in history is electrified by society's numerous political, economic, and social problems. Never before has the country been in a situation of such rapid decline in production as it is now, such crisis in the economy and in political life. It is therefore difficult to disagree with B.I. Poshkus, academician of the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, who believes that this is the result of the mistakes made by the party even during the period of perestroika. They must be admitted and assessed. The speaker rightly noted that today all attacks on the inadequate supplies of food are directed against the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, when everyone knows that 30 to 40 percent of everything produced by the kolkhozes and sovkhozes is ruined during the stages of transport, storage, and processing (about the amount of food that would provide the basic food norms for the population). Hence the need to underscore the importance of giving priority not only to the countryside in general but also the individual directions of the food program.

V.V. Aniskin, chairman of the Moscow kolkhoz imeni M. Gorkiy and CPSU Central Committee Secretariat member, was largely in agreement with the previous speaker. In particular, he said that focusing attention on

the lessons of ancient history is now causing an allergy among the people. It is therefore necessary to precisely fix the situation in the country at the moment that this program is adopted, and to explain in the document the reasons for the collapse of all the state structures.

L.I. Khitrin, first secretary of the Ryazan Oblast Committee of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party, found that some of the provisions lack preciseness in showing the party position. He noted that he was not sure whether the draft included more of a desire to please all political trends, or whether it spent too much time explaining what we communists are and what our landmarks are in the development of society. The speaker emphasized that the proclaimed equality of forms of ownership must take into account what should be the basis for the socialist economy and what forms the party prefers for the management of farming. In L.I. Khitrin's opinion, this basis should be highly mechanized production, if, as he put it, it has now become shameful to refer to the kolkhoz and sovkhoz and other objects as collective labor.

A.F. Kolinichenko, first secretary of the Orenburg Party Obkom [oblast committee], believes that in the draft the desire for all kinds of "cooperation" is importunately expressed while the actions of the party at present are expressed with diffidence. Are we not trying to become a party for everyone? It was this speaker's opinion that the document makes an incorrect assessment of the shadow economy. In fact there is nothing unexpected in this phenomenon; it is the direct result of the mistakes that have been made, mistakes that the people saw long ago and talked about.

M.A. Chertayev, chairman of a kolkhoz in Dagestan, talked about the difference between the concepts of private and individual ownership. Whereas the opposition suggests the unrestricted supremacy of private ownership, which will undoubtedly lead also to unrestricted appropriation of the labor of others, communists should give preference to individual ownership. That which is acquired by honest labor is earned. M.A. Chertayev was against selling off state property into private hands. Everything that is of the state has been created by the people. The party should act against any appropriation of others' labor, and against this labor being appropriated by the state.

The question of ownership was also dealt with by S.A. Osminin, first secretary of the Kirov Party Obkom. It is necessary to underscore, he said, that the dominant form of ownership should be collective ownership, and this also defines the priority of the party's socialist choice.

The speakers also included G.A. Posibeyev, first secretary of the Mary Republic Party Committee, and Kh.E. Berdyev, first secretary of the Surkhan-Darya Obkom of the Uzbek Communist Party. They noted the need to strengthen motives for social protection for the working man.

Agrarian Policy Commission Proceedings Reported
914A0995A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
26 Jul 91 p 2

[By A. Veprev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Agrarian and Food Commission: "The Union Treaty. Take Into Consideration the Interests of the Agrarians"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Agrarian and Food Commission has reviewed drafts of the Union treaty four times, including jointly with the Nationality Policy and Interethnic Relations Commission. The position of the agrarian deputies was worked out and adjusted, and from today's viewpoint, giving due consideration to the market programs being drawn up, the commission on the whole approves the draft treaty and believes that it is essential to have it signed as soon as possible. It is necessary to finally move from general talk to business, otherwise any plans will remain just pieces of paper.

We believe that in the sphere of managing the USSR and in the sphere of joint management of the USSR and the republics (Articles 5 and 6) provisions should be included on powers in the sphere of management of the agro-industrial complex. Today, an interregional division of labor has been established in the production of agricultural output, although attempts have been made to orient it on self-sufficiency and naturalization of farming. Under the administrative command system this was done to some extent. However, then we had interregional and interrepublic exchange. But from the standpoint of the market, this economic factor will operate objectively in favor of the Union.

Under market conditions, the nature of the location of agricultural production facilities will be dictated by natural and climactic conditions, that is, the greatest efficiency, maximum profit, or state incentive. We believe that the treaty should not only fix the division of interests and powers by region but should also orient them in such a way that when it enters into force in the future, it will not be necessary on a practical plane to find common and effective decisions for everyone, or to centralize a number of functions.

In the agro-industrial complex it is necessary to define the powers and functions of the USSR Ministry of Agriculture and Food, in whose activity all republics have an interest. What are the powers, in our opinion, that should be within the joint competence of the USSR and the republics?

In the sphere of economics, it is necessary to act with the highest degree of cooperation. I refer to a recent example: Estonia decided to liberalize purchase and retail prices for agricultural raw materials. So Russia lodged a protest about that because it was leading to serious disproportions in the movement of goods, and indeed of buyers. In order to avoid a repetition of such a situation, unity of action and agreement are essential.

Similar agreement is also needed in the formation of veterinary legislation and the use of plant protection agents. About 20 million head of cattle die each year on farms, 50 million to 60 million animals become sick, up to 9 million calves and 4.5 million lambs are lost, and tens of thousands of tons of meat and other livestock farming produce are spoiled. The comparison inevitably comes to mind. According to the draft Union treaty, definition of the foundations of policy in the field of public health has been relegated to sixth place, and there is no definition at all for joint management by the Union and republics of veterinary science and plant quarantine. We believe that this must be taken into account when the final points of the treaty are worked out, because protecting the lives of animals is just as important for man.

Another approach is required with respect to the situation in seed growing and stock breeding. Seeds for corn, for example, are grown and processed in the southern zones of Russia, in the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Moldova, and delivered to all the republics. Interrepublic delivery systems for supplies of pure-strain cattle were set in place long ago. The present system requires coordinated efforts by all the Union republics and the centralization of certain functions. I think that it will not be quite right to make do with bilateral agreements. Experience gained in working out and implementing such agreements has shown that this is inadequate, and if we look at the situation from the standpoint of a unified agrarian market, then it is inadvisable.

The present disposition of the processing industry, which rests on the movement of large quantities of raw materials and finished products from republic to republic, must also be considered. The dependence of the processing industries of the republics on imports of raw materials is on the order of 20 percent to 30 percent, and for packaged materials the figure is up to 40 percent. All of this requires coordination in their purchase, not competition in an international market.

I also suggest that no special justification is needed to form all-Union and insurance food stocks and to create reserves. This year, incidentally, shows that because of the harvest failure in some parts of the country it is essential to regulate interrepublic exchange of foodstuffs and fodders. And we have crop failures quite often.

Under the conditions of reduced funding for research it is necessary to think carefully about the question of a rational structure and optimal disposition of scientific establishments across the country's territory. What is needed is concentration not dissipation of efforts by the scientists, particularly in basic science. And in general I would like to offer one more proposal, namely, that we consider the importance of the agro-industrial complex so great that we simply regard it as essential to sign a separate protocol to the Union treaty on cooperation by the republics in the field of the agro-industrial complex.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Gives Compensation to Three Republics

LD0108194591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 1900 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] With the aim of eliminating the consequences of natural disasters in Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenia, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has allocated insurance compensation benefits of 549 million rubles for destroyed and damaged buildings from the USSR presidential reserve funds for financing urgent reconstruction and repair work and for payments to people who have suffered. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers has been instructed to examine the question of sources for financing the expenditures in these republics on the actual implementation of works for eliminating the consequences of the natural disasters.

Gorbachev Presents Awards to ZIL Workers

LD0108205691 Moscow TASS in English 2031 GMT
1 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—Over 200 advanced workers, labour veterans and department heads of the Likhachev car plant were awarded Soviet orders and medals in the Kremlin today on the eve of the 75th anniversary of the first Soviet car plant—the Moscow Likhachev Car Plant (ZIL).

President Gorbachev congratulated them on high awards. Gorbachev said that a jubilee of such a plant as ZIL is an important event not only for its collective but for the whole country as well.

When speaking of ZIL, one thinks of the working class, which is the basement of the Soviet state, he noted.

The president underlined that in the present hard time the plant collective "gives an example of the worker's character, new approaches in learning progressive methods of labour and technologies and in assimilating in new economic mechanisms."

Speaking of the transition to the market economy, which requires the restructuring of public relations and adoption of hard and often unpopular measures, the president stressed his adherence of principle to the consistent course towards cardinal reforms.

The working Moscow, whose symbol is ZIL, understands that the most important thing now is to "hold the state, the country and pass the current difficult period", Gorbachev said.

The president expressed his gratitude to Moscow workers for their understanding of complicated tasks of the current stage of development.

Arbatov Discusses Future of USSR

LD0108220791 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service
in English 1910 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] The meeting between the Soviet and American presidents opens opportunities for the cooperation between the two countries in many spheres. This is an interview granted to our correspondent by the Director of the Institute of the U.S. and Canadian Studies, Georgiy Arbatov, of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

[Begin recording] [Arbatov] There are a lot of spheres, but I would consider the most important of them demilitarization of both our societies and our relations. I think we are still the main—we and the Americans as well—highly militarized societies, which was the nature of the cold war era which is not natural, not normal now in this situation, and I hope that we have to find absolutely new approaches to this issue. And this will help us economically, both countries, and will make really the changes in our relations irreversible, and also help us in finding keys to solutions of even most complicated regional problems.

[unidentified correspondent] There are many articles both in Soviet and foreign press concerning future, the Soviet president, Gorbachev [as heard]. What could you say about this?

[Arbatov] I think that he is now, at the moment, in a rather firm position. I think that this process (?started) in Novo-Ogarevo in April, remains very important, it must not be broken up, as well as his cooperation with President of Russian Republic Yeltsin, and this will ensure his position, and I think he has a very good future. But his future can be good only if he goes on with the policy of reforms and democratization, with what we call perestroika, if he doesn't deviate from that. [end recording]

Gavriil Popov on Prospect of CPSU Split

PM2907104691 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian
25 Jul 91 p 9

[Interview with Mayor of Moscow Gavriil Popov by Fiammetta Cucurnia on 24 July; place not given]

[Text] Moscow—"No, I do not have the draft of the new CPSU program, nor will I receive one. I stopped some time ago taking an interest in everything to do with the Communist Party, because I consider it already dead, and it merely remains to be seen how and when it will fall apart." This was said by Moscow's newly elected mayor, the man who has led the advance of the radical left, together with Boris Yeltsin and Andrey Sakharov, and who now, alongside Edvard Shevardnadze, is about to found a new party on the ashes of the CPSU. On the eve of the Central Committee plenum, as the orthodox hard line communist right launches its attack on Mikhail Gorbachev, Popov seemed to have no doubts: "The time has come for the CPSU to split, and if it does not happen, it will be a matter of days."

[Cucurnia] Gavriil Kharitonovich, the CPSU plenum meets in the Kremlin today with the clear intention of settling scores with Mikhail Gorbachev, who is accused of selling the country off to the West and of destroying the party. Do you believe that the time for a split has arrived?

[Popov] When I talk about a split I mean the final end of the party structure. If only a part, however substantial, leaves it without destroying its supporting structure, it is not a split but merely a reduction. I believe that a split is now inevitable and that it will take place in the immediate future, perhaps right away, and in any case before the next CPSU congress. But I am waiting to see whether a split actually does occur.

[Cucurnia] And yet Gorbachev is presenting himself to the party's parliament with a new program absolutely irreconcilable with the positions of the right. In his favor there is only the accord with Boris Yeltsin, who is, however, unpopular with the party, especially following the approval of the decree banning the activity of CPSU cells at work places.

[Popov] The battle over the program is actually a conflict conducted within the apparatus' offices, which has nothing to do with the party as such. If an opinion poll were to be conducted, I am ready to bet that two-thirds of CPSU members do not even know what it is about. As far as Boris Yeltsin's decree is concerned, I believe that it was adopted with the specific intention of forcing the situation and exacerbating the conflict at the Central Committee plenum. The aim seems to me to be to drive the conservatives to start the battle by asking the general secretary to condemn the decree. Gorbachev would thus have to choose between the party's right wing and the accord with Russia. And the CPSU's reformist wing would be forced to acknowledge the fact that Russia's new government is pursuing its own path and that there is no longer any possibility of turning back. Under such conditions, the prospect of a split becomes more likely.

[Cucurnia] How much do you think Gorbachev's decisions are influenced now by the fear of a violent reaction from the Army and the Interior Ministry?

[Popov] I believe that Gorbachev's decisions are now influenced by Gorbachev alone. I believe that the theories about pressures from the Army are greatly exaggerated, because within the Soviet structure they usually take the form of requests, appeals, and exhortations.

[Cucurnia] Do you believe that Gorbachev is prepared to lead the split?

[Popov] Mikhail Gorbachev is no strategist. But he is a great tactician. And I am convinced that he will be guided by the actual balance of forces at play, capable of defending the party's unity or, on the contrary, of creating a split, depending on the situation facing him.

[Cucurnia] A few weeks ago you and former Foreign Minister Edvard Shevardnadze announced the birth of a

new democratic party. Then suddenly the decision was postponed until September. Many people believe that it was Gorbachev himself who requested this postponement and that you agreed, in the hope of being able to gather a large section of the CPSU's defeated army into your party.

[Popov] Gorbachev's position has had no impact on my decisions, though I do not rule out the possibility that it may have had an impact on others of the party's promoter members. Of course, we take account of the CPSU's possible split. But the main reason why it was decided to wait is that the CPSU's moderate democratic wing was not yet ready for such a step.

[Cucurnia] What are your predictions for the future division of the communist forces following the split?

[Popov] According to our reckonings, two-thirds of CPSU members will not join any other political party. That means over 10 million people, who joined the party as a state structure. The other 3 or 4 million members will be divided into three more or less equivalent parts: the orthodox right, fairly numerous but without any influence within society; the present party apparatus, in favor of perestroika but determined to fight to preserve its own role; and the third group will be that of the reformers and the moderate center, which will with every likelihood be founded within our party.

[Cucurnia] The announcement of the creation of the new democratic party seems to have sparked an identity crisis within the radical left, too, just as the intelligentsia are starting to notice a decline in Yeltsin's prestige which could in future be followed by a decline in his popularity among the people.

[Popov] Yes, the left is in a state of crisis, because it believes that it has already gained power. In fact the transformation process is not yet over, and the first aim of the party that we are about to found is precisely to complete this process in the next two or three years. And this is a crucial issue, partly with a view to the possible decline in Yeltsin's popularity which you mentioned. Soviet democracy needs a political structure capable of working autonomously, without depending any longer on the image of its leader.

[Cucurnia] Is one of your aims to provide Gorbachev's electoral banner in the next elections?

[Popov] I believe that the USSR's president must not be elected by universal suffrage. The vote would reward the Russians' wishes—and not just because the number of voters is greater. The country's president must be the utmost expression of political compromise at the head of the republics and must be elected by their representatives. We will fight for this.

On Need for New Party

914B0272A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY
in Russian No 29, Jul 91 pp 1-2

[Interview with Moscow Mayor G. Popov by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent L. Novikova; place and date not given: "G. Popov: 'A New Party is Needed'"]

[Text] *The "Democratic Reform Movement," whose initiators were A. Volskiy, A. Yakovlev, G. Popov, A. Sobchak, E. Shevardnadze, A. Rutskoy, and others evoked a mixed reaction in society. Why? This is the subject of a discussion between our correspondent L. Novikova and Moscow Mayor G. Popov.*

[Novikova] Gavriil Kharitonovich, why did the "Democratic Reform Movement" arise? I would like to know this first hand, as they say.

[Popov] Many democrats assess the situation in the country incorrectly, thinking that decisive victories have been won and now it is time to begin debates about what is to be constructed. The conflicts began for the first time in the Zaslavskiy Rayon Soviet, then they occurred in the Leningrad Soviet and here in the Moscow Soviet, and the culmination came at the Russian Congress.

[Novikova] But yet the democrats have indeed won victories both in the Leningrad Soviet and in the Moscow Soviet and in Russia. True, the positive changes are not yet being felt. Why?

[Popov] Because so far there has been no decisive victory over the old system. Let me explain. Take the economic system. Yes, cooperators, lessors, and farmers have appeared, but they comprise only 10-15 percent. If there are milk and eggs in Moscow it is not because of the new sectors but only because the old system is still working. If there is no cheese in Moscow, it is only because it is not working.

Take the political system. We have taken over part of the legislative power and part of the executive power. But the key areas—the Army, the KGB, and the militia—are still under the control of the CPSU apparatus and, for the most part, the same thing can be said of the mass media.

The third element is the national structure. Yes, there is the Lithuanian parliament, there is the president of Georgia, and the RSFSR has been able to adopt its own laws. But essentially the faucet can be turned off. On the whole we have disorganized the old system but we have not destroyed it yet. Debates about how we are to live in our future home where the floors are not yet in place and the stairways not yet built are premature.

I am convinced that there is a large group of general democratic problems that have not been solved and whose resolution affects everyone who is against bureaucratic socialism. Moreover, the situation will get worse.

This involves price increases, growing inflation, and if not a year of famine then one that will be worse than 1991.

[Novikova] But who is to blame?

[Popov] The expression "marking time," as they say, has today been filled with new meaning. Previously the CPSU was marking time. This year the democrats are marking time along with the CPSU.

[Novikova] What happens in such cases?

[Popov] History gives us our answer: A new force will appear. This is the one E. Shevardnadze was speaking about—totalitarianism, dictatorship, like in Germany in the twenties. The ones who will come to power are those who promise all the good things at rallies and declare that they are pure, that they have nothing to do with either conservatives or democrats, that they are the ones who will save the country.

[Novikova] So is the third force fascism?

[Popov] But here it will have its own "face." They will be the disenfranchised: lumpen-patriots, lumpen-chauvinists, lumpen-proletariat, lumpen-intelligentsia, lumpen-bureaucrats, and lumpen-apparatchiks. And the extreme conservatives will side with those who succeed in making fools of the masses. The result will be a lumpen-conservative variant of fascism.

[Novikova] What can oppose this variant?

[Popov] Let us figure it out. The conservatives cannot oppose them. There is no confidence in them. But the democrats are also at the end of their rope. We receive an average of 70 percent of the votes from those who participate in the elections, and this is less than 50 percent of the overall number of voters. Moreover, the democrats have no unity and they have no cadres or experience. The national communists and national anti-communists in the republics are also at their limit. Thus all participants in the current process taken separately cannot not take on all the power and all the responsibility.

[Novikova] And what solution do you propose?

[Popov] In this connection I would like to recall two histories: of 1917 and of the anti-Hitler coalition. In 1917 the democrats could not agree and they ended up with a dictatorship. And in the 1920's what was the main mistake of Stalin and his associates? They thought that in the face of fascism it was impossible to reach agreement on anything with bourgeois countries. But life has shown that the anti-Hitler coalition was created anyway, and it was victorious and rescued civilization.

And the solution now is a coalition, and a qualitatively new type of coalition which would unite the constructive forces from the democratic camp, from the apparatus camp, and from the republics with various orientations.

[Novikova] But what will unite these diverse forces?

[Popov] If we are to start to speak of the structure of our future society, the ultimate fate of the USSR, then disagreements are inevitable. But what if everything were narrowed down to a brief period: to unification for the sake of putting an end to the stage of destruction of the old system; to unification for the sake of completing the general democratic reforms; to unification as an alternative to totalitarianism? Regardless of how you look at the future fate of the Union, today it is clear to all republics that at some point it is more reasonable and advantageous to work together.

Regardless of how one may feel about versions of the market, today everyone is interested in creating the general conditions for a market economy—for example, a changeover to convertible currency.

Today we all need a strong executive power—nobody can do anything without this.

Today we all need order and discipline.

In a word, there is a group of common interests for the immediate future.

Herein lies the objective basis for a coalition. The basis of a coalition is not a segment of society but a common interest of various segments.

[Novikova] All right, let us say that there is a common interest in completing the dismantling of socialism, but is a party needed for this?

[Popov] We already have movements. They are necessary. In the RSFSR this is Democratic Russia. But a movement is an association of parties and nonparty members (they, incidentally, are in the majority). Within the framework of the democratic movement we need more durable, more solid structures, and these are parties.

[Novikova] But still you call yourselves a "movement."

[Popov] Yes, for the time being. In September at the constituent congress I am convinced that the movement will become a party. But it will not be a Leninist party in the sense we have become accustomed to—with meetings and membership cards. It must be a parliamentary party which will not command from its offices but, if it wins the elections, it will go to work in the offices of power.

The party will be created for the period until the various trends unite in order to solve two general problems: to put an end to the old and to create a common foundation for the new society.

[Novikova] Gavriil Kharitonovich, they say that literally a couple of days before the signing of the address of the "Nine" these people were prepared for a decision about the creation of a party...

[Popov] In the first place, not all of them were prepared to create a party. In the second place, N.I. Travkin insisted that the new party become the successor of the Democratic Party of Russia. Thus it would be as though they all would enter Travkin's party. Many were not pleased by this. After all, the new party should not so much reshuffle existing parties as enlist new forces, above all from the CPSU.

[Novikova] Tell me, what is the president's role in the creation of the "Movement"?

[Popov] This is a complicated question. Information is going around that the president is counting on this party. I think the president can undoubtedly count on something and it would be absurd for him not to play this political game. But what difference does it make who is playing what game? A party is to be created in September and it is impossible to belong to two parties.

[Novikova] You know, now in Democratic Russia there is the expression that Popov has been left "without legs."

[Popov] I think that time will put everything in its place. I would never forgive myself if, while seeing the main danger, the danger of the third force of fascism, I did not do everything I could to consolidate all forces interested in the democratic rather than the totalitarian version of perestroika.

Many misunderstandings are related to the assumption that the new party will set the task of eliminating Democratic Russia. But it will not set this task. I think the creation of the party will strengthen the movement and not destroy it.

We must conduct all elections in a short period of time: the Union and Russian parliaments, the elections to local executive posts, the election of the president of the country. This will make it possible to create the foundations of a market economy and a parliamentary republic. We must create economic and political conditions for a real and not a pro forma withdrawal of certain republics from the Union and the unification of others into a new Union.

[Novikova] Let us say that three years have passed and things have not worked out. What next?

[Popov] If things do not work out, the totalitarian variant will enter the arena again. For the transition from socialism to a new system is inevitable. If this is not done democratically, there is still the path of dictatorship. This is the way the market was reached—through dictatorship—by Greece, Chili, and a number of other countries. But I think we now have the objective conditions for the democratic version.

Today we all need a strong executive power—nobody can do anything without this.

Today we all need order and discipline.

In a word, there is a group of common interests for the immediate future.

Herein lies the objective basis for a coalition. The basis of a coalition is not a segment of society but a common interest of various segments.

[Novikova] All right, let us say that there is a common interest in completing the dismantling of socialism, but is a party needed for this?

[Popov] We already have movements. They are necessary. In the RSFSR this is Democratic Russia. But a movement is an association of parties and nonparty members (they, incidentally, are in the majority). Within the framework of the democratic movement we need more durable, more solid structures, and these are parties.

[Novikova] But still you call yourselves a "movement."

[Popov] Yes, for the time being. In September at the constituent congress I am convinced that the movement will become a party. But it will not be a Leninist party in the sense we have become accustomed to—with meetings and membership cards. It must be a parliamentary party which will not command from its offices but, if it wins the elections, it will go to work in the offices of power.

The party will be created for the period until the various trends unite in order to solve two general problems: to put an end to the old and to create a common foundation for the new society.

[Novikova] Gavril Kharitonovich, they say that literally a couple of days before the signing of the address of the "Nine" these people were prepared for a decision about the creation of a party...

[Popov] In the first place, not all of them were prepared to create a party. In the second place, N.I. Travkin insisted that the new party become the successor of the Democratic Party of Russia. Thus it would be as though they all would enter Travkin's party. Many were not pleased by this. After all, the new party should not so much reshuffle existing parties as enlist new forces, above all from the CPSU.

[Novikova] Tell me, what is the president's role in the creation of the "Movement"?

[Popov] This is a complicated question. Information is going around that the president is counting on this party. In think the president can undoubtedly count on something and it would be absurd for him not to play this political game. But what difference does it make who is playing what game? A party is to be created in September and it is impossible to belong to two parties.

[Novikova] You know, now in Democratic Russia there is the expression that Popov has been left "without legs."

[Popov] I think that time will put everything in its place. I would never forgive myself if, while seeing the main danger, the danger of the third force of fascism, I did not do everything I could to consolidate all forces interested in the democratic rather than the totalitarian version of perestroika.

Many misunderstandings are related to the assumption that the new party will set the task of eliminating Democratic Russia. But it will not set this task. I think the creation of the party will strengthen the movement and not destroy it.

We must conduct all elections in a short period of time: the Union and Russian parliaments, the elections to local executive posts, the election of the president of the country. This will make it possible to create the foundations of a market economy and a parliamentary republic. We must create economic and political conditions for a real and not a pro forma withdrawal of certain republics from the Union and the unification of others into a new Union.

[Novikova] Let us say that three years have passed and things have not worked out. What next?

[Popov] If things do not work out, the totalitarian variant will enter the arena again. For the transition from socialism to a new system is inevitable. If this is not done democratically, there is still the path of dictatorship. This is the way the market was reached—through dictatorship—by Greece, Chili, and a number of other countries. But I think we now have the objective conditions for the democratic version.

Laptev Says Gorbachev 'Moving Forward'

PM0108152191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 31 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

["Our Digest" feature citing 25 July NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA interview with I. Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union and member of the Democratic Reform Movement Political Council: "What People Are Saying and Writing...."]

[Text] From a 25 July 1991 NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA interview with I. Laptev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union and member of the Democratic Reform Movement Political Council:

"No matter what we think of Gorbachev, I believe that he has staked his life, his talent, and his authority precisely on transforming this system, that is, on implementing the ideas which were declared in principle in April 1985 and whose significance many people did not understand at the time. Perhaps it is as well that they did not, because they might have suppressed them from the beginning...

"It is true that Gorbachev is too fond of tactics, that he seeks to avoid making enemies, to somehow unite

everyone, and achieve a compromise even between irreconcilable sides. This sometimes turns into a big shortcoming. However, at the same time it is impossible to ignore the fact that, while he sometimes retreats or takes cover and relies on different forces at different times, he is nonetheless consistently moving forward. Words, actions, and results are very different things. And what we see is frequently only part of the iceberg..."

Yeltsin Decree's Effect on Gorbachev Viewed

PM0108111491 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 31 Jul 91 p 1

["Commentary" column by Vladimir Kuznechevskiy: "The Ice Has Started Moving, Messrs. Communists"]

[Text] People certainly expected much of the CPSU Central Committee July Plenum. Some people expected a final break with their leader, others—the majority—a recognition of realities. On the eve of the plenum 30 oblast party organizations called for Gorbachev's removal from the post of CPSU Central Committee general secretary. This demand was supported by Prokofyev, first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom [city committee]. Then another party organization—Bashkortostan's—joined in. Apparently nothing could help Gorbachev now.

Help came from a totally unexpected quarter. From the president of Russia, who issued the Decree on Departyization five days before the start of the plenum.

In the first instance, the impact of the decree could be defined in one word: "groggy." In sport, this word denotes the condition of a boxer who has sustained a powerful blow and has lost consciousness for a short time, but stays on his feet and "drifts" around the ring.

The "grogginess" had passed by the day of the plenum, and Gorbachev's opponents flung themselves upon the only man who could help them—the USSR president: "Save us!" And the USSR president reassured the plenum: The CPSU remains, albeit different, not Leninist. And he proposed that they all vote for virtually the same party program against which Lenin came into conflict with Martov back in 1903. Nearly 90 years later, only some 4.5 percent of Central Committee members voted against this program. In effect this means that the CPSU elite, after letting off steam, has reconciled itself to the decree. The Special Statement that was adopted is nothing more than an attempt to put a brave face on it. That this is so, and not otherwise, is indicated by the speeches of plenum participants. Thus Makhov, acting chairman of the Central Control Commission, expressed regret that various ideas are flung at the CPSU—and among these ideas he named the Decree on Departyization—and we, he said, instead of combating them, "adopt them, so to speak, for implementation, and start working around them." Pomorov—the man who replaced Zorkaltsev, Ligachev's creature, on Tomsk Obkom [oblast party committee]—while coming out against "solid presidential power," nonetheless

approved Yeltsin's economic policy, stating that "Siberians support the Russian President, who has signed a directive on contract prices" while the center is only edging in that direction with the brakes on. And Lavrentyev, secretary of the Bashkir State University party committee, called for the Decree on Departyization to be approached from the standpoint of the folk saying: "Every cloud has a silver lining." Communists on our territory, he said, have been losing political battles for a long time. It is time to form party structures on a neighborhood basis. And I am not talking about housing committees, he stressed, because under the decree, party organizations cannot be set up there, either. We must go over to a system of party clubs, party organizations for special interest groups, and so forth.

So departyization has begun. I do not think this process need be artificially accelerated, because it is already in fertile soil. But where there is conscious resistance, I think, the Russian prosecution service will show its character. But at any event, wisdom is needed on both sides.

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Baltics, Army Control

LD0108151891 London BBC Television Network in English 2130 GMT 31 Jul 91

[Interview with former Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by correspondent Charles Wheeler in Moscow on 31 July—recorded in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] [Wheeler] Early this morning, before the news from Vilnius reached Moscow, I asked him that whether the warnings he gave, when he resigned from the government last January, about a right-winged dictatorship, still applied.

[Shevardnadze] Since then, serious events have happened. On the one hand, the elections of the Russian president, and the mayors of Moscow and Leningrad, show that the democrats and reformers can stand up for the creation of a state based on the rule of law. On the other hand, there have been alarming events in the Baltic states and in Moscow. If we talk about today, and the balance of forces, I'd say the danger has not receded. A deteriorating economy has caused greater social tensions, and in such an atmosphere, cataclysmic events are possible, including political ones. So, all democratic reformers should go on trying to unite against the chance that the worst might happen.

[Wheeler] You spoke of alarming events, and the Baltics. This obviously involved the military. People in the West always talk about the danger of a military takeover. Are you afraid that there could, in certain circumstances, be some kind of an attempt at a military takeover at the center?

[Shevardnadze] You will remember, the president made the statement saying that he was not aware that the events in the Baltics were happening. And I would like to

believe him. If that is so, and it is possible to bring in troops and tanks against the people and the lawfully elected parliament without the sanction of the president, then you cannot rule out the same thing happening in Moscow and other cities.

[Wheeler] In other words, in the Soviet Union today, the military forces are not under political control? Under Gorbachev's control?

[Shevardnadze] I still think that if the president was not aware of these actions, he should draw the right conclusion and take control of the military and the garrisons across the country.

[Wheeler] What is it that prevents President Gorbachev from taking control of the military?

[Shevardnadze] You're right to ask this question. I think the president and the Supreme Soviet, and the Congress of People's Deputies, should react more strongly to events like those in Tbilisi and in the Baltics, and the lawless behavior by the military and other organs of state power. Nobody has been punished for those terrible tragedies in Tbilisi and other places.

[Wheeler] Is this why you left the government?

[Shevardnadze] It's one of the reasons why I resigned.

[Wheeler] Your movement for democratic reform, Mr. Shevardnadze, is it to become a political party?

[Shevardnadze] Congress, in the autumn, will answer the question whether we remain a movement or create the party within it. I, personally, don't rule out the formation of the party as the core of the movement. It will be a strong opposition party that would exist alongside other parties, including the Communist Party—a parliamentary party with its own platform for presidential elections, etc.

[Wheeler] You left the Communist Party and formed your movement for democratic reform. President Gorbachev has stayed in the party, and is trying to reform it from inside. Is it your view that the Communist Party is beyond reform? Beyond redemption?

[Shevardnadze] I came to the conclusion that the complete transformation of the party is impossible. The traditions established, over decades, are too strong. The right-wing conservative forces are too influential and reactionary. So, I decided that though the party should continue to exist—it's lawfully registered—another party, no less strong, no less influential, in the country, in the republics, should also exist. I believe that can be done.

[Wheeler] There is, obviously, an even chance that the Communist Party will split. Would you welcome that? And if that did happen, which way would you expect President Gorbachev to go? With the reformers, or to stay?

[Shevardnadze] If there is a split, Gorbachev will stay in the party, probably, along the reformers and supporters of perestroika. He cannot do otherwise. If he stayed with the conservatives, he would obliterate all perestroika's achievements. For in spite of the problems we face, a lot has been achieved, but it will be a very difficult choice for him.

[Wheeler] Mr. Gorbachev launched perestroika with the support of people like you, now he's running into major problems. Do you think that he should, perhaps, give up the leadership, and the Soviet Union should, now, be looking for another leader?

[Shevardnadze] He must continue this process. There is no alternative. If I were him, I might have been more decisive, but he has chosen this hard and complicated way, a revolutionary way, and he must go on. I genuinely want him to stay, but maybe in a more decisive way.

Democratic Reform Leaders Welcome Yeltsin Decree

PM0108113291 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA
in Russian 31 Jul 91 p 1

["Statement by Members of the Democratic Reform Movement Council in Connection With the 20 July 1991 Decree of RSFSR President B.N. Yeltsin," under the rubric "Departyization"]

[Text] The Decree of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] President "On Terminating the Activity of Organizational Structures of Political Parties and Mass Social Movements in State Organs, Institutions, and Organizations of the RSFSR" is the long-overdue next stage in the process of democratization of society's development. We believe that it is in accordance with the USSR and RSFSR Constitutions and stems directly from the USSR Law on Parties and Social Organizations.

We support the Decree, and in preparing the documents for the Founding Congress of our Movement in September 1991, we will proceed on the basis of the Decree's provisions. At the same time we believe that the Decree should be supplemented by measures to guarantee political parties equal material and political conditions for functioning in the conditions of departyization, taking into account the fact that today, in effect, the CPSU has a material base outside enterprises and organizations.

[Signed] Members of the Movement Council:

A.P. Vladislavlev, V.A. Makharadze, I.D. Laptev, A.I. Muzykantskiy, N.Ya. Petrakov, G.Kh. Popov, A.V. Rutskey, I.S. Silayev, E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev.

Government Orders Halt to Privatization of Dachas*LD0108111691 Moscow TASS in English 1101 GMT
1 Aug 91*

[Text] Moscow, August 1 TASS—The USSR Cabinet of Ministers has instructed union ministries of justice and finance to "review the circumstances relating to the sale of dachas and property", belonging to the former executive department of the USSR Council of Ministers and union ministries.

In a resolution published today, the government ordered state agencies to stop privatising dachas and other leisure facilities until the passage of corresponding regulations.

Cabinet on Air Traffic Controllers' Problems*LD0108125491 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service
in English 1200 GMT 1 Aug 91*

[Text] On the eve of a general air traffic controllers' strike scheduled for 10 August, the Soviet Cabinet of Ministers has ordered that they be included in a list of professions with very difficult working conditions. Due to this, air traffic controllers may receive a special old age pension.

Their trade union insisted on this demand among others which it handed over to the government recently. Other demands include higher pay and a shorter working week.

Commentator on Implications of Draft Program*PM0108150191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1*

["Political Diary" commentary by Nikolay Yefimov: "Road to Accord and Trust—Radical Change in Our Entire View of Socialism Needed"]

[Text] The scenario prepared by the foreign and national press for the CPSU Central Committee Plenum remained unclaimed. In vain did journalists stand in the pouring rain on Red Square in anticipation of a scandal. The course of the plenum had nothing in common with these foreign and domestic Cassandras. Yes, at times the atmosphere in the hall seemed to me to be so charged that, as passions seethed, there could be an explosion at any moment. But how could passions be anything but high given that the speeches concerned the fate of the party and society, given that the time had come for everyone to state his or her position clearly. Nevertheless, despite everything, common sense, an air of calm consideration, and reasonableness prevailed.

For how long?

On more than one occasion recently the idea has been mooted that the Decree on the Departyization of State Organs and Enterprises promulgated by RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] President B.N. Yeltsin involuntarily brought the plenum participants together. Having brushed with danger, the "threat from without," they displayed an instinct for self-preservation

and postponed internal feuds until more propitious times. It is possible that to some extent the decree acted as a sobering device. But can all the explanations be traced to this? This would be too simplistic. I repeat, passions seethed, and they were genuine passions. Furthermore, a totally conflicting idea was expressed, and from the plenum platform, too: We must thank the Russian president for a decree which is, at last, forcing party organizations to move from talk to action and work actively outside the confines of enterprises directly in the electoral districts and residential areas.

The answer, as I see it, lies elsewhere. Often we judge one or other political event by the accompanying noise created on the fringes, and we forget that the distance between extremes is very great and that this distance in no way runs through a vacuum. At the last plenum but one (April)—which was a stormy plenum—when, if you remember, the question was asked outright, only 13 people supported the extremist solution. At that time, IZVESTIYA reported on the statement by 72 Central Committee members supporting the perestroika policy. I venture to claim that if the recess during which this statement was composed had been longer, the bulk of Central Committee members would have signed it. Despite undergoing a major crisis, the party does have a commonsense center which is geared to reforms and which made itself known in April and revealed itself in July. Will it withstand all the trials awaiting it this year? Will the draft Program prove a strong basis upon which to consolidate the CPSU's sensible forces? Many plenum participants answered this question in the affirmative and left Moscow with this hope and belief.

The Program discussed at the plenum was not a normal one, if such a term can be used, but one based on new principles. As a member of the Commission To Prepare the Program I can confirm: Each of the versions (the fifth version was submitted to the plenum) became steadily shorter and more dynamic. But this is not the most important thing. Each version of the draft Program moved further away from dogma, myth, and boring clichés. It is not just the commission members themselves who have perceived all this. Not at all. Heated discussions took place, and it must be acknowledged that they were meaningful and substantive. An agonizing reappraisal of the past and present took place.

As you know already, the plenum adopted the draft Program. With one condition: It needs additional work. The commission had tried to present the draft in the shortest possible form so that it read easily and did not look like a manual. But I suppose they overdid the abridgment, dropping a few essentials, bypassing the odd conjunction, and in places even the argumentation. Of course, this matter can be amended. On the whole, the criticism of the draft was constructive. The most important thing is that the key thesis on the need to radically alter our entire view of socialism was adopted. Will the party accept such a change?

The forthcoming discussion of the draft in the party organizations and at the 29th, extraordinary congress will clarify this question. Twice—once in the keynote report and once in his closing speech—M.S. Gorbachev stated that the theoretical and practical model of socialism has proved unworkable and has suffered a strategic defeat. F.M. Dostoyevskiy once placed these telling words about socialism on the lips of one of his heroes, reflecting the fruit of his own meditation and observation: "The idea is great, but the preachers are not always giants...." Our own experience has convinced us of this, it seems. It was not giants that brought us to this current situation. Now historians have the task of debating and establishing whether our country had the chance to avoid being diverted at the end of the 1920's onto the bureaucratic-authoritarian path and to develop instead the foundations laid by Lenin when he introduced the New Economic Policy. Alas, history cannot be rewritten. The crisis of socialism and the socialist idea is only too evident. Hence, also, the need for a new Program and the democratic perestroika of all areas of our life and the renewal of the party. It must become the party of democratic reforms.

Life has shown that even great ideas can be subject to crises.

The plenum resolved to publish the draft Program in the near future. The reader will be able to decide for himself how far it alters our view of socialism, which dogmas are being rejected and what is new in the proposals. I will concentrate the reader's attention on two facts. Many speakers mentioned the first. The second did not warrant any attention from the speakers, which means just one thing in the context of a discussion—their accord.

First. The draft Program proceeds from the fact that, alongside Marxism, other conceptions too of our own and of world humanist thought—that is, the entire diversity and the entire wealth of the manifestation of the socialist idea—lie at the source of contemporary socialist theory. When solving today's problems, it seems, we will not constantly be looking back at the titans of the last century. They did everything they could. But they could not solve our problems for us.

Second. The rejection of the principle that "the end justifies the means." Many parties in various countries have resorted to and still resort to this principle, although they will not admit it. We can only welcome the CPSU's rejection of it as proclaimed in this important document. This is, if you like, a way of purging the party of all the filth and other things which have hindered it and damaged its authority. People may ask: Is this really important? Yes, it is important! They may ask: Was it really like that? Unfortunately, it was. I remember very well the 25th CPSU Congress at which L.I. Brezhnev stated in the keynote report: "...For us, anything which serves the interests of the people, the interests of communist building, is democratic." He spoke amid applause in the vast Palace of Congresses. And he continued: "...We reject anything which runs counter to

these interests, and nobody will convince us that this is not the right approach." It is quite possible that no person could convince us, but there is a force which is stronger than the will and character of any leader or any party. Life has persuaded us, life has brought us to the conclusion that this approach was wrong. For if we translate this thesis into normal language, then in practice it too meant that "the end justifies the means."

The implementation of this principle did a lot of harm to the party and to society. Of course, it was simpler, easier, more convenient to govern in that way. But for this we had to pay with Afghanistan, lawlessness, human rights violations, impasses in our domestic and foreign policy, mistrust toward us on the part of other peoples—and our own above all. It is a thousand times more difficult to act according to one's conscience, to act honestly and justly. They say that politics rewards virtue by elevating its possessor to the position of a target to be shot at. This is true. Tactically speaking, no-win situations are inevitable here, but, strategically, looking to the remoter prospect, this is not simply a moral approach—which in itself is important and solely acceptable—it is the most reliable way of elaborating and implementing a serious, responsible policy, and the most reliable path to the people's trust.

Plenum Attendees Criticize Draft Program

PM0108153991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 30 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

["Plenum Participants Comment"—KRASNAYA ZVEZDA headline]

[Text] Colonel A. Litvinenko, Volga-Urals Military District party committee secretary:

I attended the Central Committee Plenum as a guest. Naturally, I did not have the right to vote. I was operating in the "receiving mode" only, so to speak.

The draft new CPSU Program was discussed. It evoked a mass of fundamental objections. In my opinion it has substantial flaws. The draft is presented as a minimum program, as a program for the period of society's transition to market relations, but even as regards the minimum, the party's aims are not properly defined in the draft. What do we aspire to? How are primary CPSU organizations to act in conditions of severe economic and political crisis. A great deal is said about the market. But the market is a specific concept. There is a goods market, a labor resources market, and a raw material market. Geographical conditions and traditions also vary from region to region. However, it seems to me, the draft program fails to take account of all this. It was no accident that a debate arose at the plenum on these points, as a result of which it was decided to further elaborate the document.

I would also like to express my opinion on another point. It was decided that the "finalized" draft should be adopted at an extraordinary CPSU Congress in November-December.

The timing of the congress evokes reservations. Will this not be too late? After all, we know from the press that the constituent congress of the Democratic Reform Movement is scheduled for September. In August the constituent conference of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Vice President A. Rutskoy will be held (incidentally, here is an interesting paradox: The RSFSR president bans political parties from state structures, while his vice president is cobbling together a new party and doing so, one assumes, during his working hours and from his office). Meanwhile the CPSU is once again lagging behind.

Colonel I. Arabadzh, Kiev Military District party committee secretary: Ayatollah Khomeini, when switching from religious to temporal power, cut his vocabulary by half. He pledged to refrain from using any kind of pseudoscientific terms. Why? He wanted people to understand him.

I am saying this because the draft program abounds in clever turns of phrase, ambivalent concepts, and foreign words, as if it had been put together by professors of ancient Latin from prerevolutionary lyceums rather than Russian people: Only "consensus" and "consolidation" are any good.

The language of the professional politician, of a political document must be understandable to the people.

And another thing about the draft: It is verbose and complicated. Once again when the history of society is being discussed it is a question of "ashes on our heads," of which everyone has had enough. There is excessive theorizing and false grandeur. I am convinced that it will not feature as a contribution to the treasure house of Marxist thought. What we need is a document for concrete work. And consequently also clear guidelines that are understood by everyone. This will revive the party. And, most important, the working people will know what it wants and how it intends to reach its aims.

Colonel M. Rudachenko, Carpathian Military District party committee secretary: I agree with my colleagues' remarks. Let me add one point. The draft permits believers to join the CPSU. In my opinion, that's the limit. That takes the cake, as people say in this type of situation.

Take it from me, I have nothing against believers. They can be the best of people. But in this case we are not talking about moral qualities. We are talking about world outlook. About idealism and materialism. Following the logic of the compilers of the draft, the CPSU might soon consist solely of religious people. What do they need an action program for? After all, it would be enough to put

a priest in charge of a primary organization and instead of concrete work turn to the Lord in prayer: "Let us pray, brethren..."

Prohibitive Cost of Foreign Travel Deplored

PM0108151491 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 1 Aug 91 p 1

[Ye. Kuzin article: "I Will Never See You Again...."]

[Text] The USSR Cabinet of Ministers has once again "delighted" us with Resolution No. 452 of 8 July, specifying certain tariffs for those who intend to cross our Motherland's borders.

The issue of a foreign passport now costs 1,000 rubles [R], and a supplement to a Soviet passport costs R200. Children and participants in the wars admittedly have a 50-percent discount.

The Gosbank [USSR State Bank], having checked with the black market, has set a new "tourist" rate for the dollar: R32.64, instead of R27.6. The old rate lasted four months. There are fears that a further "renewal" of the rate can be expected in the near future.

It has become known from unofficial sources that, in addition, an increase in prices for air tickets on international flights is to come.

In theory travelers can still buy up to \$200 a year. But it is now virtually impossible to buy that sum in practice. On the order of the Vneshekonombank [Bank for Foreign Economic Activity], at exchange points, instead of currency, they are offering "checks," which they say can be exchanged for dollars. But not until you get abroad.

You also have to fork out for a summons. An invitation to a socialist country "costs" about R1,500, and to America about R3,000.

Thus a trip to Europe will cost you R9,000-11,000, plus six to eight weeks spent in waiting lines. If that does not suit you, you can pay R30,000, and they will do it all for you.

TASS Reviews 2 Aug Soviet Central Press

LD0208062391 Moscow TASS in English 0525 GMT
2 Aug 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow August 2 TASS—Today's newspapers focus on the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow, President George Bush's departure home and his visit to Kiev.

PRAVDA publishes full texts of speeches made by Bush and Gorbachev at a farewell ceremony in the Kremlin.

"The signing by the Soviet and U.S. Presidents of the Strategic Arms Reductions Treaty undoubtedly capped the summit," PRAVDA writes.

The START treaty is the first step towards replacing militarised political thinking with normal human thinking, it writes.

The Soviet Union and the United States entered a new era in bilateral relations, an epoch of trusting good-neighbourly cohabitation between countries and continents which were only recently divided by ideological and military abysses, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA writes.

The summit resulted in a dash from mistrust and confrontation to cooperation and even partnership, TRUD writes.

The resulting progress in bilateral relations resulted in an irreversible, principled turnabout in international development, it writes.

Newspapers continue commenting on Russian President Boris Yeltsin's decree banning political activity at work-place.

The decree violates the Russian Constitution and infringes on workers' democratic rights guaranteed under the Soviet and Russian Constitutions, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA quotes two lawyers as saying.

The decree is a step back to authoritarianism, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA writes.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN comments on a republic-wide referendum in Armenia on secession from the Soviet Union, planned for September.

Armenia should take part in work on the new Union treaty and sign it, SELSKAYA ZHIZN writes.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA carries details about the explosion in a train bound from Moscow to Baku on July 31.

TRUD comments on proposed price hikes for wool and leather.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA reports that Soviet designers are working on a new Mir orbital station.

Newspapers publish a government resolution on implementing a parliament resolution "On the Work of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission on Privileges and Measures to Implement Its Suggestions".

Under the resolution, the prosecutor's office, the supreme court and the control chamber will investigate the sale of dachas and other property to officials.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries an interview with Deputy Chief of the KGB Contraband Department Colonel Sergey Volokhov, who speaks about the clamp-down on drug traffickers.

PRAVDA carries an interview with Bulgarian Socialist Party leader Alexander Lilov on the occasion of the party's centennial.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA comments on life in Kuwait. Saddam's regime is the worst monster borne by the Arab soil, it writes.

Saddam should be put on a black list of enemies of the world civilisation compiled by UNESCO, it says.

Economic

CPSU Commission Discusses Conversion

PM0108133591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
25 Jul 91 Second Edition p 2

[By V. Izgarshev: "There Are Results But There are Also Reserves; in CPSU Central Committee Commissions"]

[Text] Yesterday a joint session of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for Military Policy and Socio-economic Commission examined the question of the progress of the conversion of defense production facilities.

What is the real return from conversion? The production of consumer goods in the defense complex has increased by 12.5 billion rubles compared with 1988, or by 47 percent, the production of manufacturing equipment for the agro-industrial complex has doubled, and the production of equipment for light industry has increased 70 percent. The proportion of civilian output at enterprises of the military-industrial complex is now over 50 percent.

So the results can be seen. But, the session stressed, they could be more substantial and significant if the conceptual bases of conversion and the legal norms of its implementation were substantiated promptly and comprehensively at state level.

The workers of the military-industrial complex have many acute economic and social problems. Many enterprises and organizations, in connection with the drastic reduction in appropriations, have found themselves on the verge of bankruptcy. There is a drain of scientific cadres from the institutes and design bureaus. There is a sharp decline in the former prestige of the military industry worker. In terms of their wages level the enterprises of the military-industrial complex have slipped to 11th place among the sectors of the national economy.

There was also a discussion of the question of the progress in fulfilling the 28th CPSU Congress resolution "on the main avenues of the party's military policy at the present stage." The session was addressed by O.D. Baklanov, the commission's chairman, and Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister.

More on Cabinet Decisions on Economic Matters

*PM0108103191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Jul 91 Union Edition p 2*

[Unattributed report: "In the USSR Cabinet of Ministers"]

[Text] With a view to ensuring the timely conclusion of contracts for the delivery of consumer goods to trading organizations for sale to the population and ensuring interrepublic deliveries in 1992, the USSR Ministry of Trade, the USSR State Committee for Light Industry, other interested USSR central state management organs, intersectoral state associations, state associations and concerns, and the corresponding republic management organs are tasked with holding interrepublic wholesale fairs in Moscow in August-December 1991 in conjunction with the USSR Ministry of Economics and Forecasting, the USSR Ministry of Material Resources, and the USSR Central Union of Consumer Societies.

The USSR Ministry of Material Resources, the USSR State Committee for Light Industry, other interested USSR central state management organs, intersectoral state associations, state associations and concerns, and the republic material and technical supply organs are tasked with holding in conjunction with the USSR Ministry of Economics and Forecasting exchange auctions and fairs for the wholesale sale of raw and other materials and components for 1992 before the aforementioned fairs take place.

With a view to providing coal for the population and municipal and everyday needs, the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]'s proposal, coordinated with the USSR Ministry of Economics and Forecasting, the USSR Ministry of Material Resources, the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and the Ukrainian SSR Cabinet of Ministers, on delivering an additional 3.7 million tonnes of coal to consumers in the second half of 1991, including 1.3 million tonnes of Donetsk coal, 1.7 million tonnes of Kuznetsk coal, and 0.7 million tonnes of Neryungri (power industry) coal, at the expense of a corresponding decrease in exports of these coals, has been accepted.

In light of this the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations and the USSR Foreign Economic Bank are ordered to refrain in 1991 from purchasing 3 million tonnes of Silesian and 0.7 million tonnes of Baga-Nor coal and to compensate coal industry enterprises under republic and Union jurisdiction for the losses in hard currency revenue because of the reductions in coal exports by means of the resources allocated by the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry to pay for imported supplies.

The USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation is tasked with providing air transport throughout the second half of 1991 for the crews of ships belonging to the Ministry of the Fish Industry via charter flights and additional Aeroflot flights. The USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry

must pay in rubles for the expenditure entailed in providing this air transport.

Foreign currency expenditure for the air transport in question during the second half of the year will be put down to USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation operational expenditure in hard currency in line accordance with the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution of 1 March 1991 and with a reduction in the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation's payments in freely convertible currency to the Union-republic hard currency fund laid down by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution of 30 April 1991.

As of 1 July the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has set for 1991 the rate for payments into enterprises' hard currency funds at 50 percent of earnings from the export of painted wooden handicraft products of the Khokhloma, Semenov, Gorodets, and Polkh-Maydan schools after the obligatory sale of 40 percent of the hard currency to service the USSR's foreign debt.

Defense Industry Official on Conversion Process

*LD0108220391 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service
in English 0800 GMT 1 Aug 91*

[Text] The general director of the major defense production association, Polet [Flight], in Siberia, producing missile and outer space technology, has criticized the government program of conversion for its landslide character. His enterprise was ordered to double production of consumer goods in a year. The Americans allow no more than five to six percent growth rates of conversion a year, said the director.

Now the difficulties are behind, and the association produces commercial satellite communications systems, construction and medical equipment. They plan to start producing a multipurpose plane, the An-74, capable of operating in Arctic conditions. Over 400 military production plants have joined the conversion program in the Soviet Union.

Thefts From Railroad Pose Mounting Problem

*PM0108155991 Moscow Central Television Vostok
Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT
30 Jul 91*

[From the "Vremya" newscast; by S. Sergeyev and V. Otryanov, from Chelyabinsk-Glavnyy railroad station]

[Text] [Announcer] Thefts of national economic goods on the country's railroads have risen sharply. Losses already total tens of millions of rubles. The criminals' loot is large shipments of raw materials, semifinished goods, scarce consumer goods, and imported goods.

[Sergeyev] In terms of intensity of traffic, this is one of the country's busiest rail junctions. The Transsiberian Railroad, which links Europe with Siberia and the Far East, passes through here, and there are dozens of connections with other railroads. The abundance of goods in freight cars, flat cars, and containers attracts

people who find there is nothing left to steal in the empty warehouses of trade depots and stores. So they come here.

Since the beginning of this year alone there have been more than 3,000 thefts of national economic goods. This is three times as many as last year.

Essentially there is nothing to stop the thieves. The guards are powerless and there are few of them. There are no rigorous checks at exits from freight yards. And as for fencing, you can see for yourself... [video shows half-collapsed wall]

We arrived at the Chelyabinsk-Glavnyy station's container depot just as an investigation task force was getting down to work. Eight of 12 containers dispatched from Tashkent to Perm had been broken open. Some of the goods—fur clothing, cosmetics and perfumes, phonograph records, and household utensils—had been stolen. Transport militia staffers told us that more than 50 thefts of this kind have been recorded this year alone. In all, losses resulting from thefts have topped 1.5 million rubles.

[V.A. Zhadanov, South-Urals Internal Affairs Administration chief for transport matters, identified by caption] At present there are only enough guards to accompany 10 percent of the goods requiring protection. These are the most valuable goods.

I believe that the time has come to concentrate the Ministry of Railways departmental security staff on special-category goods and on guarding tunnels and bridges, while we ought to set up a nondepartmental security service on the lines of the nondepartmental security service established at internal affairs territorial organs to guard all freight depots, goods yards, and container depots, where goods and material values totaling tens and hundreds of millions of rubles are concentrated. I believe that this would improve the operational situation considerably.

Agriculture

Deputy Premier Senko Views Agro-Industry Tasks

PM0208082191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jul 91 Union Edition p 2

[Interview with USSR Deputy Prime Minister Fedor Senko by V. Gavrichkin; date, place not given: "The Food Complex is the Ultimate Foundation"]

[Text] [Gavrichkin] A document elaborated recently by the government is called the Program of Joint Actions by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and Governments of the Sovereign Republics to Extricate the Country From the Crisis in Conditions of the Transition to the Market. I would like to hear your description of the program.

[Senko] Certainly, the scale and depth of the crisis gripping the country demand resolute, swift measures, in

particular, measures that are out of the ordinary. I assume you deliberately cited the full title of the document in your question. It is indeed a Program of Joint Actions. The very wording reflects a very important political and economic feature of the present moment. On the one hand, the republics' sovereignty and the decentralization of management in all spheres of the national economy, and, on the other hand, the vital need, recognized by everyone, to reestablish a common economic space.

The thorough restructuring of the economy, the radical shift in the direction of addressing people's needs and requirements, and the building of a socially oriented market economy are the program's strategic goals. None of them can be achieved unless we unite the efforts of the center and the republics and all labor collectives and public movements. And we certainly will not accomplish the immediate tasks without joint action.

As for the role and place of anticrisis measures in the agrarian sector, I will say the following: An entire range of measures has been outlined to provide economic incentives for agro-industrial commodity producers and working people in the food sectors, to improve management efficiency, and to create real opportunities for people to display initiative and enterprise.

The program envisages accelerating the actuation of agro-industrial production, market regulation mechanisms and establishing real owners of land—on the basis of the improvement of production relations on actual kolkhozes and sovkhozes by means of leasing, the establishment of small intrafarm peasant cooperatives and associations, and the introduction of stocks, shares, destatization, and privatization. The creation of a mixed economy is a powerful lever for healthy competition among commodity producers and the transition to the market is impossible without it.

The manifestation of peasants' real autonomy is their establishment of commodity production volumes on the basis of supply contracts, free choice of how they sell the products, the transition to contract prices in the main, and distribution of profits at their own discretion.

[Gavrichkin] But agro-industrial complex enterprises are now almost entirely under the jurisdiction of republic and local organs of power. Accordingly, they bear full responsibility for providing food for the people on their territories. What is there left for the center?

[Senko] A great deal! For instance, hardly anyone disputes the need to reestablish a common economic space. But if this space is going to actually exist, central organs have to contribute in every way to its formation and strengthening. They have to take on the job of forming all-Union state food and agricultural raw material resources, including reserve stocks. Of course, one cannot do without union republic regulation of price, credit, and tax policy. The making of forecasts, outlines, and comprehensive general state programs comes into the same category.

Unfortunately, we are lagging well behind in many areas of equipment and technology. Access to the scientific-technical achievements of developed countries is absolutely necessary, otherwise we will always be trailing behind. To that end it is important to exploit the opportunities presented by the conversion of defense enterprises, obtain licenses, create joint facilities for the production of modern equipment, and seek all manner of forms of international cooperation. In particular, proper organization of material and technical supply for the agro-industrial complex is inconceivable without Union organs' active participation.

The center remains responsible for the economic regulation of intersector barter equivalence and monitoring of price parity.

[Gavrichkin] You have just touched on the most delicate question, Fedor Petrovich. It is no secret that the rise in wholesale prices of material and technical resources, tariffs, and services, the widening of the practice of contract prices, and also the sharp (almost threefold) increase in the cost of capital construction have meant an enormous amount of extra expenditure for the countryside.

[Senko] Indeed, it created an emergency financial situation for the vast majority of farms. A solution had to be sought. Recently the Cabinet of Ministers adopted a resolution envisaging compensation measures. The document is a principled one.

How did people act before in such cases? An imbalance would occur—it would be followed by an increase in purchase prices or bigger subsidies from the budget. But today, in the period of transition to the market, it becomes increasingly difficult to manage prices, in fact it is unlawful. That is why compensation is based on market principles.

Since 15 June farms have been able to sell poultry, eggs, wool, leather, tobacco, and tea at contract prices. In addition, they are authorized to sell at contract prices up to 30 percent of agricultural products, toward the amounts stipulated by forward contracts. At the same time, the resolution determines measures ensuring a reduction in farms' expenditure on production. So, together with the other measures, mixed feed prices have been reduced by 30 percent on average. This will not only mean a gain of approximately 7 billion rubles [R] for rural producers, but will make for better use of forage grain and reduce the cost of livestock products. What I have said also applies to citizens' subsidiary plots.

Enterprises and organizations in the agro-industrial complex are also exempt from payments to economic stabilization funds and their payments to the budget for the sales tax have been significantly reduced.

But that is not all, the USSR Finance Ministry must join the republics' governments in adopting immediate measures to compensate kolkhozes, sovkhoses, and other

agro-industrial complex enterprises for expenditure connected with compensation payments to working people in connection with the retail price increases. Indeed, the extra revenue from this will go to the republics' budgets. Moreover, it was deemed necessary to compensate all enterprises in the agro-industrial complex for the higher cost of capital construction.

[Gavrichkin] Okay, so the scissors [from lines of graph of diverging prices for agricultural products and industrial goods] that are cutting the agro-industrial complex economy can be considerably blunted. But what about in the future? After all, prices of industrial products, wage rates, and the cost of services are continuing to increase

[Senko] This trend is indeed taking place in many sectors of industry, particularly on the part of enterprises that are monopoly producers. So the Cabinet of Ministers, in its resolution, drew the attention of enterprise and organization leaders to the inadmissibility of monopoly diktat and price hikes. Republic governments and state pricing and price control organs were instructed to utilize their right to abolish excessively high prices and put a stop to the actions of officials behaving in an arbitrary manner.

But by and large, certainly, we need a well tuned mechanism for maintaining price parity between the agro-industrial complex and other sectors of the economy.

[Gavrichkin] The mechanism can be created. But how do you make it operate effectively? It is clear from the compensation measures you mention that the republics are supposed to get the lion's share of the funds.

[Senko] But this is in fact an example of joint actions taking into account the delimitation of powers. The resolution was elaborated with the participation of the republics' agro-industrial organs and governments. And it will be implemented on a joint basis.

Whenever the republics depart, say, from the agreed price policy it leads, as a rule, to the infringement of other territories' interests. The result is that "price wars" are added to all the other "wars." You start getting the artificial "enclosure" of territories—customs houses, export bans, and so on. In such an "extra-economic" space it is extremely difficult to take market relations on board, conduct equivalent exchange, and observe mutual interests.

[Gavrichkin] It seems to me that for exchanges to be truly equivalent a great deal needs to be done in agriculture itself. Expenditure there is still too great. You will argue that no government can afford to compensate for mismanagement or just badly organized production.

[Senko] I completely agree with you there. Questions of improving labor productivity, the consistent implementation of land reform, and the development of a mixed rural economy, which I have already discussed, are widely represented in the anticrisis program.

But everyone must learn to approach the matter without lurching wildly in one direction or another. People are still regularly calling for private farms, but they leave the new owners without financial support, resources, and services. Or, on the other hand: The farm is going nowhere, so to speak, but the peasants' sincere ownership urge—to have shares or a share of land or stocks—and their desire to be farmers, cooperative workers or leaseholders in an association meets with a resolute, "Don't you dare!" Yet it is this path that creates the possibility of a breakthrough to a new mode of management.

Of course, when reforming production relations within kolkhozes and sovkhozes it is necessary to preserve the established, economically valid production specialization of farms. It is an ingredient of high productivity.

In my view, we have by no means fully exploited the potential of the lease system, but people have already started to criticize it like crazy. Yet today's leaseholders, having gotten a taste for real work, tomorrow could be in possession of the means of production or owners of them. Indeed, the majority of today's kolkhozes and sovkhozes are essentially a ready-made base to provide organizational, sales and supply, and maintenance services for the new owners.

But all this must be organized thoroughly and in earnest, rather than perfunctorily. Equal conditions must be established for all forms of management. And every effort must be made to help the countryside.

Meanwhile... judge for yourselves. It is feed procurement time, harvest time, but wherever you look there are unsolved problems: a shortage of equipment, spare parts, fuel, construction materials, packaging, manpower. So it is a matter of honor for all citizens to help the countryside: anyone who can, and without any self-interest. And if there are those who are unwilling to know this honor, let them not complain about their meager dinner fare.

[Gavrichkin] Much has already been said and written about additional measures to help the countryside bring in the harvest. But there is one matter I would like to single out. I am referring to grain purchases for state resources. The situation has become extremely bad in recent years. Procurement discipline has slackened and parochialism has flourished. As a result you have disruptions in the supply of grain for the population and feed for industrial livestock raising and an increased in purchases of foreign grain.

[Senko] To prevent this from happening in the future the USSR Cabinet of Ministers adopted an important resolution the other day to ensure coordinated actions by Union and republic organs to form state resources of grain from the 1991 harvest. Republic governments and the USSR State Committee for Purchases of Food Resources are instructed to adopt measures (even conclude extra forward contracts) to purchase at least 77 million tonnes of grain. The state order is now strictly

binding. If any republic fails to fulfill it, it has no right to seek compensation from all-Union stocks.

[Gavrichkin] Do you think a big "stick" would help?

[Senko] Certainly ...Discipline is discipline. After all, the very same resolution provides for "carrots." Republic governments are recommended to use a month's worth of market allocations of cars, refrigerators, washing machines, clothes, footwear, construction materials, coal, and various other consumer items by 1 October 1991 to encourage sales of grain in excess of the state order.

The allocations are being transferred to procurement organizations. A kind of "grain currency" rate has been set. For instance, you have to provide 400-500 tonnes of grain for a vehicle from the Kama Truck Plant and 250-300 tonnes for a Likhachev plant car. It has been decided to sell imported sewn and knitted goods and hosiery in exchange for grain on a ruble-for-ruble basis.

To provide an incentive, mixed feed will be supplied in exchange for grain at prices that are 30 percent lower. The practice of paying for grain and oilseeds in freely convertible currency at world prices will be continued. The currency will be used to acquire the latest equipment and technology.

And another detail: Farms that have fulfilled the state order can now freely sell grain on the consumer market. Moreover, consumer organizations are able to buy grain in exchanges at the prices they state.

[Gavrichkin] So the agro-industrial sector is definitely addressing the market?

[Senko] Indeed it is. And it is doing it strictly in line with the program of anticrisis measures.

Saratov Heatwave Hits Grain Yields

PM0108165591 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA
in Russian 27 Jul 91 p 1

[By Oleg Zlobin: "Meeting on Saratov Territory"]

[Text] Saratov Oblast—I.S. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, was in Saratov Oblast on a working visit 25 July.

After brief talks at the local airport, he flew to the rayons most affected by drought.

As a result of highly unfavorable conditions—fierce heat and a lack of rain—an extreme situation has emerged in Saratov's Volga region. Approximately 1 million hectares of agricultural crops have perished. The harvest of winter grains is eight to 10 quintals per hectare lower than expected. The yield of spring grains is even lower: Machine operators are threshing a mere four to five quintals per hectare. Preliminary figures indicate that

the gross grain harvest will not exceed 2.5 million tonnes. This is half the planned amount.

Consequently, difficulties have arisen with supplying the Volga region with grain products and the livestock sector with forage. Expert calculations state that just 60 percent of feed requirements for local herds will be met.

Oblast leaders have turned to the Russian Government with a request that Saratov's Volga region be regarded as having suffered a natural disaster and given aid in the form of foodstuffs and forage grain.

On his tour of the oblast the head of the Russian Government was accompanied by leaders of the republic's agricultural and procurement organs and the local leadership.

At a meeting with correspondents I.S. Silayev stated: "Our aim is to collaborate with experts and specialists to conceive and draft measures which will lessen the blow from the elements."

Military

CPSU Commissions Discuss Military Issues

PM0108143391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 26 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

[By Colonel V. Semenov: "In CPSU Central Committee Commissions"]

[Text] A joint session of the CPSU Central Committee Military Policy Commission and Socioeconomic Commission has been held.

Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, chief of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate, and A.I. Gromoglasov, first secretary of Arkhangelsk RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Obkom [Oblast Committee], delivered reports on progress in fulfilling the 28th CPSU Congress resolution, "On Basic Guidelines for the Party's Military Policy at the Present Stage."

It was stressed that among the party aktiv, the overwhelming majority of the country's Communists and working people, and the personnel of troop units there is profound understanding of the need to strengthen the motherland's defense capability and security at the level of reliable and reasonable sufficiency and to ensure the priority of qualitative parameters in military organizational development. Communists unanimously advocate keeping fundamental questions of the country's security within the exclusive competence of the Union.

Much is being done to shape positive public opinion regarding defense problems. A considerable role in this is played by work in connection with the 50th anniversary of the most important events in the Great Patriotic War, which is coordinated with military-political organs and Army and Navy party committees.

At the same time, the session noted, there are many unresolved issues in the implementation of CPSU military policy. Party committees do not always take into account the changes in the military-political situation in the world, the acuteness of the political struggle in society, including the struggle for influence in the Army, and the new approaches toward defense problems.

The theme of the social protection of servicemen and members of their families was also trenchantly raised at the session. Here are just a few figures: The shortfall in the allocation of housing to the Defense Ministry is increasing and is now 500,000 square meters with regard to resettlement from closed military camps and 735,000 square meters of shared-participation housing.

Concern was expressed at the lag in the process of legislatively formalizing the party's military policy. It was proposed to tell Communist members of the USSR Supreme Soviet to provide timelier assistance in completing preparatory work and adopting the USSR laws on defense, the status of servicemen, and the universal military service obligation, the statutes on the performance of military service by officers and warrant officers, and the general military regulations. In view of the partywide importance of the basic guidelines for the CPSU's military policy, ways of making it more specific to take into account changes in the social and political situation in the country were formulated.

The joint session comprehensively examined a wide range of urgent problems of the conversion of defense production facilities.

O.D. Baklanov and Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister, addressed the participants in the session.

Fleet Admiral Makarov Navy Day 1991 Interview

91UM08034 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 27 Jul 91 pp 1,3

[Report on interview with Admiral of the Fleet K.V. Makarov, chief of the Main Staff and first deputy commander in chief of the Navy, by A. Orlov on the eve of USSR Navy Day; place not given: "For the Flag and the Jack"]

[Text] The large ASW [antisubmarine warfare] ship, pulling up its anchor cable, slowly shoved off from the mooring wall. The mooring crew in orange jackets, after pulling in the mooring line, came to attention. Farewell... to shore, to Vladivostok, to the motherland. This is the familiar melancholy feeling of parting. Only now you will remain on shore. And all you can do is wish those you are seeing off: Smooth sailing, lads.

The ocean and the sky themselves have no borders. But where they come together they form a clearly visible border—the horizon. Over it, from time to time, as if on an iron-clad schedule, a Neptune appears—a U.S. land-based patrol aircraft. Expect it from the direction of the

sun—in the morning from the east, in the evening from the west—and you will not be wrong.

The fact that the Neptune will soon appear became known on the BPK [large ASW ship] Tashkent even before the aircraft intersected the line of the horizon. At first, signals intelligence picked it up, and afterward the aircraft passed to the radar surveillance "department" and formed a dot on the circular scanning screen. The plotters began to track the target.

Bearing... Range... Bearing... Range... Now it was possible to go out on the main deck—several more minutes, and then the Neptune will appear before the clear eyes of the signalmen. On the bridge wing, Senior Seaman Nikolay Atrikhaylov turned his binoculars to the anticipated sector. He spotted the target the moment it transformed from invisible to visible. He reports: Bearing is constant, range is decreasing, and elevation is not increasing. This means that the aircraft is headed straight for us. The flight altitude of the Neptune is equal to the height of two to three of the ship's masts.

The Neptune turned right before the very side. It went far ahead on the course of the BPK. Returning, it once again rushed past with a loud roar. The pilot repeated the flyover several times. What is now guiding them? In any case, not a desire to admire the lines of the Soviet ship from closer up.

From an interview on the eve of Navy Day with Admiral of the Fleet K.V. Makarov, chief of the Main Staff and first deputy commander in chief of the Navy.

[Orlov] Konstantin Valentinovich, you are a person who has more than once observed the operations of foreign ships and aircraft in meetings at sea. It is known that there were frequent shows of force on their part and very different attempts to "check on the nerves of the Russians." At sea today there are quite a few encounters with ships and aircraft of various powers. Has anything changed in the way of behavior toward us.

[Makarov] Actually, the ocean is really crowded today. The navies of the most diverse countries have become ocean-going, and their mutual relations are a kind of barometer of the relations between their countries. There were times when they became strained, even to the limit, and there were other times. Today, owing to the many steps of the USSR in the international arena, trust in interstate relations is increasing. This also has an effect on the crews of ships and aircraft at sea. They have begun to conform more, as is customarily said, to good naval practice.

Intergovernmental agreements on the prevention of incidents at sea continue to make a big contribution to increasing the safety of navigation and also to a relaxation of tensions between the sides. They are now in effect with 10 countries, including with the United States, Great Britain, the FRG, France, Canada, and Italy. Their implementation has a positive influence on relations at sea. In all cases, to avoid the risk of collision,

for example, ships must remain at a sufficient distance from each other. Aircraft must observe the greatest caution. Ships and aircraft are forbidden from conducting simulated attacks with respect to ships and aircraft of another country coming from the opposite direction. These, one wants to hope, will become principles of international naval ethics once and for all.

[Orlov] It seems that it is possible to talk about the fact that confrontation on the world ocean is ending, or, in any case, is coming to an end?

[Makarov] I would not be in a hurry with conclusions that are so unequivocal. Unquestionably, the world today is not the same that it was even two to three years ago. The processes of detente are becoming stronger. Conventional arms and armed forces in Europe are being reduced, and a treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms is being readied for signing. At the same time, these processes have not yet broached the area of military confrontation at sea. Qualitative improvements in sea-based strategic offensive arms are continuing, the number of aircraft carriers with nuclear power plants is growing, and the number of carrier-based aircraft is increasing. By the year 2000 this kind of NATO aircraft fleet will consist of 1,200 units, and of these, about 500 nuclear weapon delivery vehicles.

But the mass deployment of the newest sea-based cruise missiles? It will not only compensate for the withdrawal of medium- and shorter-range missiles from the countries of West Europe but will almost double the real threat to the security of the USSR practically from all strategic directions. We will add the presence of large amphibious assault landing formations [soyedineniye] and marines in the countries of the West. And we will not forget that the readiness of the NATO countries' navies is directed first and foremost at the rehearsal of operations against the forces of the Soviet Navy and the delivery of strikes on our coastal installations. This year alone NATO members conducted several dozen exercises, and of these about 30 were in immediate proximity to the USSR. And so judge...

[Orlov] Today, when the country's Navy is preparing to celebrate its 300th anniversary, how do you evaluate talk of the fact that the Navy has outlived its time?

[Makarov] Frankly speaking, I have not heard such assertions from specialists worthy of respect, both military and civilian, including from abroad. Indeed, judge for yourself, how can this be seriously considered? The Navy is vitally important to our country, which is washed by the waters of 12 seas and three oceans. Moreover, the Navy is rather strong, inasmuch as it is hardly reasonable for such a state to have deliberately weak armed forces. Finally, the almost 300 year history of the Russian Navy, and afterward the Soviet Navy, shows convincingly: This is an institution that is selflessly loyal to the Fatherland and ready for self-sacrifice on behalf of its interests. Perhaps that is why attacks are

being made against it? But I think that it is clear to everyone: Preserve the Navy, preserve the state...

[Orlov] Russia always prided itself on its sailors. The names of Admirals Ushakov, Nakhimov, Makarov, and Kuznetsov are imperishable in its history. Today, the prestige of naval service is by no means high. Is there something from which new Ushakovs and Kuznetsovs can be cultivated?

[Makarov] It is customary to relate sailors to a community of people who treat traditions with special care. For example, the system of naval education has already existed for 290 years, and it takes its beginning from Peter I. In 1701, he established the school of navigational and mathematical sciences in the Sukhareva tower in Moscow. Continuously developing, the system of education and training of sailors today completely meets Navy requirements.

At the same time, the crisis in secondary school education has placed a number of difficult problems before us. A surface ship or a submarine today is the embodiment of advanced science, equipment, and technology, which must be managed by professionals of the highest qualifications. But the level of knowledge of our youth from whose number our naval school cadets are selected is falling more and more. Indeed, the spiritual qualities, ethical principles, and work habits, alas, are not at an apex. True patriots of the Navy are helping us, those who organize naval clubs and camps. It is very difficult for them today—market relations are oppressive. We help with what we can, and we give support in every way possible.

Thus, in that we have talented officers and young people who are attracted to the sea, the fatherland is not impoverished. This means that Ushakovs and Nakhimovs will appear.

[Orlov] Concern over the fortunes of the Navy... It was always a touchstone on which the quality of statesmen was honed. But today we hear that the Navy is aging, its construction programs are being cut.

[Makarov] All of the negative processes that are now bringing pressure on the armed forces also affect the Navy in full measure. While the reduction of expenditures on the purchase of weapons and military equipment is quite justified under the present difficult conditions in which the economy of our country finds itself, the ongoing reduction in operational expenditures and ship repair and capital construction has had an extremely painful effect on our fleets. Many problems accumulated around these questions in past decades as well. And now more problems have been added.

Today, the strictest decrees actually are not operating, and the concept of state discipline for many organizations and enterprises is an anachronism. In addition, the transition to new industrial prices implemented since 1 January 1991 reduced our capabilities substantially.

What is the way out of the situation that has developed? We see it most of all in granting the Navy independence in the formation of its own budget. Of course, within the framework of those resources that are allocated to it annually by the USSR Supreme Soviet and Ministry of Defense.

[Orlov] There is another facet of concern: about the life of sailors and personnel in service afloat. It is not right when commanders of strategic submarines do not have apartments and the families of sailors frequently live with relatives "on the continent."

[Makarov] The problems are large, although in recent years the Navy has been directing up to 60 percent of all capital investments allocated to us to development of the social sphere. It is enough to say that, with the forces of the construction organizations of the fleets, in 1990 we were able to put into operation 60 residential buildings with 4,466 apartments, one dormitory with 80 rooms, a barracks for 400 persons, a polyclinic for 100 visitations, a first aid station, three stores, a kindergarten, and two schools. And the plan for 1991 provides for the construction of 59 residential buildings, five dormitories, three barracks, three mess halls, an obstetric building, a polyclinic, five stores, and a school. It would be nice, of course, to accelerate the pace of construction, life requires it, but the ceiling on capital investments has been sharply lowered.

[Orlov] Our readers, Konstantin Valentinovich, have a considerable interest in innovations in the Navy. First of all, there is the switch to a two year term of service on a contractual basis. The experiment that has started in a number of formations [soyedineniye] is of interest.

[Makarov] Life changes, we are trying to keep in step with the times, and we are seeking new approaches. It is too early to talk about any results of the experiment: It is intended for the years 1991-1994. For the time being preparatory work only has been started for its undertaking.

As for the one-third reduction in the term of service, this unquestionably will not help improve the quality of training of compulsory service personnel. But we entered into this experiment under the pressure of circumstances over which we had no control. At the same time, we developed measures for the intensification of training of specialists. But this reduction in service also has a positive side—there was an immediate reduction in the number of conscripts who previously did not want to serve in the Navy because of the three year term of service. This was also indicated by the results of the completed spring call-up. Alas, this also has to be considered.

[Orlov] It turns out that the Navy has quite a few problems today. Nonetheless, tomorrow is a holiday. Our readers and the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA collective congratulate the military sailors on this day. As before, the people believe in their defenders, and, as before, they want to be proud of them.

Estonia

Republic Leaders Express Condolences on Tragedy

OW0208043391 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1900 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Estonian Parliament's press service reports Chairman of the Estonian Supreme Council Arnold Ruutel and Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar have sent a telegram of condolences to Chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis following the tragedy at the Lithuanian border post Medininkai on the border with Belorussia where six people were killed. The Estonian leaders expressed hope that killers will be detained soon.

The telegram also says that "the incident in Lithuania shows once again that the Baltic states should decisively struggle to reach their goals and defend their security and interests of their peoples on the basis of the international law."

Latvia

Gorbunovs Sends Condolences on Border Attack

LD0208073891 Riga Radio Riga International
in English 2030 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] Anatolijs Gorbunovs, the chairman of the Latvian Supreme Council, today sent a telegram to Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis and Prime Minister Gedimanas Vagnorius expressing the condolences of Latvia's Parliament and Government on the shooting of eight people at the Lithuanian customs post of Medininkai on Wednesday.

Three customs officers and three police officers were killed by gun shots in the head. Two men remain hospitalised in critical condition contrary to previous reports that one had died.

The telegram reads in part: The people of Latvia were with you in the days of January. Now in pain and sadness we bow our heads honouring the memory of the July victims.

Republic Procurator Justifies Border Post Attacks

LD0108212591 Riga Radio Riga International
in Latvian 0430 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] The Procuracy of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]—in the view of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia, this is an illegal administrative structure here in Latvia—has again been justifying attacks on customs posts. Meeting in Daugavpils with officers of the public order protection organizations loyal to the idea of the unity of the Soviet Union, (Reinieks) first deputy procurator of the Latvian SSR, repeatedly justified the attacks by the OMON, the subunits of the USSR Interior Ministry's special operations militia, on customs posts. (Reinieks) announced that formations

such as customs posts are not allowed to exist in the republic, and there must be a struggle against their existence by methods allowed under USSR legislation. If the activities of the OMON in the Baltics are to adhere to the framework of the decree of the President of the USSR, then those means could also include the demolition of the customs posts, (Reinieks) said.

'Special Tasks Unit' Fighting Street Crime

LD0208085991 Riga Radio Riga International
in Latvian 1930 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] During recent weeks the special tasks unit of the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs regularly detects three to four serious crimes a week, providing significant support in combatting crime, said one of the commanders of this unit. This special unit of the militia was formed in May of this year to fight against street crime and to detain dangerous criminals.

The unit is formed following special principles, only the physically and psychologically best prepared militia workers being chosen. As opposed to the specially trained OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] subunit of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the members of the new special unit are loyally disposed toward the Republic of Latvia.

Baltic Officials Receive U.S. Delegation

LD0108193191 Riga Radio Riga International
Service in Latvian 0430 GMT 31 Jul 91

[Text] Janis Peters, the permanent representative in Moscow of the Republic of Latvia, and high-ranking representatives of the Republic of Estonia who were present, were visited yesterday evening by high-ranking personnel of the United States. In the delegation was Alexander Vershbow, the representative of the U.S. President and head of a section at the State Department. He was accompanied by First Secretary Judith Mandel of the U.S. Embassy. The U.S. representatives were informed by the Latvian side of Latvia's favorable attitude to the offer of technical assistance, not within the composition of the USSR, but directly to the Baltic states.

Latvia, Poland To Sign Interstate Treaty

OW0208055391 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1900 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The newspaper "DIENA" says a Latvian-Polish interstate treaty may be signed in late August or in early September. A Polish delegation has been in Riga since July 29 working on its draft.

Head of the delegation, Deputy Director of the Polish Foreign Economic Relations Ministry's Foreign Trade Department Mr. Rataevic pointed out that this is the

[Makarov] Thank you for the greeting.

first economic treaty between Latvia and Poland since the 2nd World War and that its signing has been coordinated with Moscow.

Deputy General Director of the Latvian Government's Foreign Economic Relations Department J. Kanels told the newspaper that the draft treaty provides for the general principles of trade and economic relations, as well as indicates spheres of cooperation.

The draft treaty envisages mainly barter trade, but clearing is also possible.

Mr. Rataevic says similar treaties with the Ukraine, Belorussia and Moldova are being prepared.

Latvia, Czechoslovakia To Sign Economic Treaty

*OW0208051691 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1900 GMT 2 Aug 91*

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Latvia and Czechoslovakia will sign a treaty on economic cooperation August 2 in Riga. A Czechoslovak delegation led by Ambassador to the USSR Rudolf Slansky is due to arrive in Latvia Friday morning.

As spokesman for the Latvian Government Foreign Economic Relations Department Janis Karklins told BF [BALTFAX], the list of goods for trade has already been compiled but is to be specified during the signing of the treaty. The two countries will conduct a clearing trade taking into account world market prices.

The two sides will not establish a period of the treaty's validity committing themselves to sign protocols annually.

Lithuania

Further Details of Medininkai Killings Given

*OW0208043491 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1130 GMT 1 Aug 91*

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The head of the press bureau of the Lithuanian department of the KGB of the USSR, Lieutenant-Colonel Algirdas Rukshenas, told a "BALTFAX" correspondent over the telephone that thus far the investigation has established that bullets made in 1974 for an old model of the Kalashnikov machine gun were used by the people who attacked the Lithuanian customs station, Medininkai. Six people were killed in the attack.

The Lithuanian Prosecutor General, Arturas Paulauskas, said at a press conference on Wednesday that the initial examination of the site revealed that the attackers had one goal alone, "to destroy the customs officers, because their personal effects and official customs documents were left untouched."

Mr. Paulauskas reported that preliminary evidence suggests that the outrage at Medininkai and the explosion in Vilnius are unconnected. As "BALTFAX" earlier reported the explosion took place on 31st July at 02:48 in Vilnius near the building that houses the headquarters of a division of internal troops.

The Lithuanian Minister of Internal Affairs, Marijonas Misiukonis, who also took part in the press conference announced that it had been decided at a meeting of the Lithuanian Government that a reward of 500,000 rubles be offered to anybody able to help the investigation to identify the criminals.

AS "BALTFAX" reported from the Lithuanian Ministry of Health, the condition of the two injured customs officers remains serious but is not deteriorating. This, in the words of the doctors, enables us to hope for a turn for the better in the next three or four days.

This report contradicts the report received yesterday that one of the injured customs officers had died in hospital.

On 1st August work began at the extraordinary session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet in Vilnius. The main item on the agenda is "on the terrorist and repressive structures of the USSR in Lithuania."

Probe Into Murders Continues

*OW0208022091 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1310 GMT 1 Aug 91*

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The head of the information bureau of the Lithuanian Parliament, Rita Lapkute, reported at a briefing in Vilnius on 1st August that the two injured customs officers hospitalised on Wednesday with gunshot wounds in the head are in a serious condition. One of them is going to die. It is just a matter of time, she said. The condition of the other may improve but at the moment he is still unconscious.

As "BALTFAX" reported earlier, an attack took place at the Lithuanian customs station at Medininkai on 31st June [as received] at 03:00. As a result six police and customs officers were killed and two customs officers seriously injured.

According to the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD) and the office of the Lithuanian Prosecutor General, there are no signs at the site to suggest that any resistance was offered. "They were taken by surprise, disarmed, made to kneel down and shot," said Mr. [as received] Lapkute.

She also reported that the details of the medical autopsies would be released on the 1st August in the afternoon or evening.

The head of the Lithuanian Parliament's information bureau refuted the version of events offered by TASS that this was a border conflict between Lithuania and Belorussia.

"What happened had nothing whatever to do with Belorussia," said Mr. [as received] Lapkute. She noted that the "border conflict" version had been seized upon by foreign radio stations and so "TASS (could) give itself a pat on the back. They have done their job."

It was also revealed at the briefing that during the examination of the site of the murders at Medinikai five automatic bullets were found as were twelve cartridges. Approximately 800 metres from the post a police car was found, the search for which was announced on Wednesday. It disappeared from the post after the events of 31st July.

It is reported that the independent Lithuanian newspaper "RESPUBLIKA" has decided [to] pay a monthly grant of 500 rubles to the children of those police and customs officers who died at the customs post at Medinikai. Four of the six murder victims were married and are survived by six children aged between 1 and 12 years. The grant will be paid until the children come of age.

Landsbergis Addresses Supreme Council

*LD0108163391 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network
in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 1 Aug 91*

[Excerpts] Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, addressed an extraordinary session of the Lithuanian Supreme Council today on the Medininkai incident. [passage omitted] He announced the names of those who perished. They are: Juozas Janonis, Mindaugas Balavakas, Algimantas Juozekas, Antanas Musteikis, Algirdas Kazlauskas, and Stanislovas Orlovicius. [passage omitted] The chairman of the Supreme Council also reported that Rihardas Rabavicius and Tomas Sernas were seriously wounded. Currently they are in the hospital and doctors are fighting to save their lives. [passage omitted]

Talking about this act of terrorism at the Medininkai customs post, the chairman said that the incident was preplanned. He drew attention to the fact that it has been two days since the collaborators' television started instigating and urging the nation to rise to struggle against its legal government. Also, it seems that a telegram received from President Gorbachev two days ago, demanding observance of the articles of the USSR Constitution, is not an accidental background component in the issue.

Therefore, the situation is becoming similar to that in January, when, before the violent treatment of our people, tension was being increased in various ways.

Talking about the attacks of the notorious Special Purpose Militia Detachment [OMON], V. Landsbergis noted that yesterday, raids by the USSR repressive unit were recorded on both sides of the Lithuanian-Latvian border. Therefore, he stressed, we can make the conclusion that all this blends into one chain of terrorism. The chief of the Vilnius OMON has denied participation by his unit in the execution of the crime. However, bearing

in mind what he said after Nevzorov's fabrication, it is not possible to believe him, V. Landsbergis said.

Talking about the intentionally fanned tension in Lithuania, the chairman of the Supreme Council again mentioned the false TASS information, in particular the tendentiously distorted views of President Bush about the events on the Lithuanian border.

Vytautas Landsbergis, commenting on Soviet President Gorbachev's description of the event, termed it very regrettable. Gorbachev said that all possible means are being used in order to avoid conflicts, as if Lithuania was in conflict with Belorussia, or armed clashes were taking place in Lithuania itself. Moreover, the USSR president compares the situation in Lithuania with that in Karabakh. One may expect, Vytautas Landsbergis noted ironically, that maybe they will not shoot at our villages from helicopters.

The chairman of the Supreme Council also stressed the importance of President of Russia Boris Yeltsin's statement that the OMON unit should be withdrawn from Lithuania, moreover, as its presence in Lithuania is not only illegal, but dangerous. Vytautas Landsbergis stressed that we must demand that the occupation army be withdrawn from Lithuania.

Supreme Council Debates Incident

*LD0108191391 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Aug 91*

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet held an emergency session today. The EUROPE-FORUM AGENCY reports that the session's agenda includes debates on Soviet terrorist and repressive bodies operating on the territory of the Republic. Landsbergis noted that the TASS report about events in Lithuania is imprecise. Neither Kryuchkov, the KGB chairman, nor anyone from this service addressed Parliament today or yesterday, offering help in the investigation of the incident at the customs post.

Competent sources said that the murderers used automatic weapons to shoot from a distance of 10 centimeters, that is, at gun point.

Today's session of the Supreme Soviet was an emergency one. It was convened because of yesterday's events at the customs post in Medininkai. Deputies discussed the cruel murder of the customs and police officers of the Lithuanian Republic and honored the memory of the victims by a minute of silence. Then, deputies discussed the situation in Lithuania, having adopted an address to all democratic states of the world urging them to help Lithuania stop the voluntarism of the USSR's military forces in the Republic. The Supreme Soviet also adopted an address to the governments of Iceland and Denmark, which said that the question of the threat to peace and security in Lithuania should be discussed by the UN Security Council.

Further on Supreme Council Session

*LD0108221491 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network
in Lithuanian 1600 GMT 1 Aug 91*

[Correspondents report on 1 August session of the Supreme Council of Lithuania]

[Text] [passage indistinct] Procurator General Arturas Paulauskas reported on the actions adopted by the Procuracy. He said an agreement has been received from Internal Affairs Minister Boris Pugo to inspect the Special Purpose Militia Detachment bases in Vilnius and their premises where weapons are stored and to interrogate the unit's members.

The director of the country's defense department, Audrius Butkevicius, drew the attention of the deputies to the fact that in Lithuania there is an attempt, with the aid of terrorism, to provoke an armed conflict, discredit government structures and to present to the world an image of Lithuania as unstable and unsafe for foreign tourists and businessmen. Audrius Butkevicius noted that everything should be done to withstand this wave of terror and to avoid taking even one step backward.

The session was also addressed by Chief Police Commissar Liutauras Vasiliauskas, who answered questions from deputies.

After brief debates the deputies examined draft documents. Many documents were adopted. They include an appeal to all democratic countries in the world on the withdrawal of the Soviet Union's repressive structures from Lithuania; and a Supreme Council appeal to all democratic states in the world asking for measures to immediately remove the KGB and all repressive structures of the Soviet Union from the territory of Lithuania and thus remove the threat to peace and to people's security. The document expresses the conviction that the fulfillment of this legitimate demand is linked with the intention of the Soviet Union to hold a conference on humane fundamentals in Moscow.

An appeal was adopted to the members of the European Security and Cooperation Conference. In view of the continuing Soviet aggression and of the new threat, they are asked to apply the mechanism of extraordinary situations of this conference in the normalization of Lithuanian-Soviet relations and to send a mission to Lithuania and to consider the possibility of a conference on the fundamentals of humaneness in the Soviet Union.

An appeal was adopted to the Parliaments of Iceland and Denmark asking that the governments of these countries raise the question of the Soviet Union's aggression and the (defense) of Lithuania's independence at the UN Security Council.

The Supreme Council expressed its protest that the Soviet Union's president Mikhail Gorbachev, at the news conference, attempted to compare the killings in Medininkai with events in the Transcaucasus and because TASS attempted to present this tragedy as a

clash and not as a murder from an ambush, [instead] as incidents between Lithuania and Belorussia. The Lithuanian Supreme Council states in protest that the aim of this disinformation is to conceal the real organizers and executors of the killings [words indistinct] peaceful neighborhood of the Lithuanian and Belorussian peoples which cannot be thwarted by any provocations.

The session also adopted an appeal to the people of Lithuania and a resolution on the perpetuation of the memory of the KGB victims.

After the adoption of these documents, a closed Supreme Council session took place. The Provisional Defense leadership reported. The session continues.

Parliament Discusses Tragedy

*OW0208034591 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1730 GMT 1 Aug 91*

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The press centre of Lithuania's Supreme Soviet told BF [BALTFAX] that in the afternoon, August 1, a closed sitting of the Provisional Defence Administration, headed by Vytautas Landsbergis, began in Vilnius.

In the morning August 1, Lithuanian Parliament gathered for an extraordinary session to speak about the terrorist and repressive structures of the USSR in Lithuania.

Among the speakers at the morning session were Chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Vytautas Landsbergis, Procurator-General of the Lithuanian republic Arturas Paulauskas, Deputy Prime Minister Zigmantas Vaisvila, Director General of the Home Defence Department, Audrius Butkevicius. The press centre of the Lithuanian Parliament announced that all the speakers concentrated on the attack on the customs post in Medininkai in which 6 people were killed and 2 wounded.

After the lunch break the Lithuanian Parliament adopted 6 documents related to this tragic incident.

At 8 p.m. Arturas Paulauskas and the members of the commission which is investigating the attack will give a press conference.

Republic MVD Reinforced for Investigation

*LD0208130591 Moscow TASS in English 1231 GMT
2 Aug 91*

[Text] Moscow August 2 TASS—Soviet Interior Minister Boris Pugo today held a special conference to discuss the investigation into the assault on the customs post of Medininkai on the Lithuanian-Belorussian border in which six people were killed.

According to the Soviet Interior Ministry, a task force set up by the minister and all law enforcement bodies in

Lithuania, irrespective of their subordination, maintain normal business-like contacts and have complete mutual understanding.

Working consultations are also held at the level of the Lithuanian leadership and the Soviet Interior Ministry.

Pugo ordered the reinforcement of the Lithuania-based Soviet Interior Ministry task force with the best qualified detectives and experts. Acting together with the Lithuanian Interior Ministry, they are assigned to meet all demands of the central and local law enforcement bodies made in the course of the investigation.

Interior Ministry Official on Events

LD0108192391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] Our correspondent Anatoliy Fedorov asked Aleksandr Rostovtsev, a representative of the Public Relations Center attached to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs to express his point of view regarding the [Lithuanian-Belorussian] border events.

[Begin recording] [Rostovtsev] There could be a lot of interpretations of this tragedy, which caused broad public response, and the brutality of which shocked everyone, including us—employees of the law enforcement bodies. After I had learned about this tragedy I spoke to Boleslav Makutynovich, commander of the Lithuanian OMON [special purpose militia units], because his detachment was accused of being the perpetrators. He flatly denies this, saying that not even one of his people was situated in that area that night. All his fighters were at their base in Vilnius. And not only that: Approximately two hours before the crime on the Lithuanian-Belorussian border took place there had been another accident. I mean, a powerful explosion which took place near a building accommodating a subdivision of Lithuanian internal troops in the Lithuanian capital. The explosion was so powerful that all the glass in the building was broken. Nearby houses were also damaged. Fighters of the Lithuanian OMON were urgently called out to prevent possible provocations against them. They remained at the base in full combat readiness.

All possible measures are now being undertaken to find the criminals. A group of employees of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, namely employees of the main criminal investigation directorate and the main directorate for the protection of public order, has left for Lithuania.

[Fedorov] The leadership of the country's Ministry of Internal Affairs, and namely Boris Pugo, have expressed their regret that all these events and this tragedy took place in the course of the visit of U.S. President Bush to our country. So what is the opinion of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry—was it a provocation, or something else?

[Rostovtsev] I think it was a provocation. Even so, an investigation is now under way. It will tell us whose hands it was playing in. But in principle, you can judge

yourself which forces can benefit from destabilization and from an attempt to ruin negotiations between the USSR and U.S. leaders. In any case, it would not be the center. [end recording]

MVD Official on Killings Investigation

LD0108211591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Aug 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Yesterday, the news about the tragic events in Lithuania swept the entire country. Our correspondent met with a spokesman of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. [MVD].

[Begin recording] [Correspondent Valeriy Bakarinov—caption] In yesterday's conversation yesterday you promised there would follow some almost sensational announcement about the events in Lithuania. But is there any such announcement?

[A.G. Chernenko, head of the public relations centre of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs—caption] I said that on the morrow—that is today—we would be able to speak more specifically about this matter. However, in the category of sensations I may only say that in Lithuania the relevant institutions have set a reward of R 500,000 to assist the search for the criminals who perpetrated this terrible crime. This is an unprecedented amount at the present stage, and it shows how gravely all this has been received and what serious significance is being attached to it.

[Bakarinov] Nevertheless, a whole day has elapsed, and probably there is something to add to yesterday's TASS report.

[Chernenko] Let me specify for the listeners of the "Vremya" programme that two of the wounded are still alive. I may further report that some of the best civil investigations specialists have left for the scene of the tragedy. I am officially authorized to state that we are ready to extend support to and cooperate with any law-enforcement bodies of Lithuanian. I regard it as a matter of honor for everyone to pool their efforts and tackle the task of seeking out these criminals.

[Bakarinov] My colleagues from Russian Television are of course splendid people, but yesterday, in some strange way, they obtained pictures from the scene of the event and showed the bodies. From the position of the bodies it is impossible to say that the attack had been a surprise one.

[Chernenko] You know, I am not personally a leading professional, but I have heard interpretations of what was seen, and many professionals consider that such a tragedy could occur at a moment when people are talking, say, to a person they know, or to a person who poses no threat to them, and so forth. That is to say, this is a very strange situation.

[Bakarinov] One gets the impression that the MVD is, as it were, concealing some details of the investigation. I have in mind here the weapons and cartridge cases.

[Chernenko] The usual regulations exist for operational investigations. We are observing them, as are our Lithuanian colleagues from the law-enforcement institutions engaged on this. I may say only—and this I think is no great secret—that some evidence has been discovered at the scene of the crime. At any rate, there are empty cartridge cases from a Kalashnikov automatic rifle, manufactured apparently in 1974, a weapon which is spread throughout the territory of the Soviet Union. It is nonsense to say that it exists only in some or other specific sub units or in some particular areas. No one is concealing anything from anyone. Professionals have no reason to whitewash anyone. They must find the criminal. [end recording] [video: correspondent interviewing Chernenko in an office]

Correspondent on 'Political' Killings

LD0108201191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1510 GMT 1 Aug 91

[From the "Panorama" program; correspondent Elena Kurkletite report from Lithuania]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] As we have already reported, a tragedy has occurred in Lithuania. On 31 July, at about 0500, the bodies of six Lithuanian officials were found at the Medininkai border post. They belonged to a special police unit, the ARAS, the highway police and customs service. According to a provisional investigation, automatic weapons were used to shoot them dead. Two seriously injured customs officials were also found there. They are now in a hospital. We asked our correspondent in Lithuania, Elena Kurkletite, to report in more detail on the circumstances of this tragedy.

So, what is the condition of the two injured men? And what has been learned so far about the circumstances of the murders?

[Kurkletite] The condition of the two injured men continues to be serious. One of them is in a critical condition. They are both unconscious. Doctors are doing their utmost to save their lives, although hopes are fragile since the bullets passed through their brains.

Today, almost all republican newspapers publish photographs of the bloody carnage. Some newspapers are already reporting the first findings of preliminary forensic investigation. Almost all the bullets which did not strike the bodies of the deceased drilled holes in the floor, or the lower part of the walls. No bullet holes were found at head height. This means that the victims were forced to lie down, or kneel, before being shot dead at point-blank range, from a distance of roughly 10 centimeters. They were all killed by volleys of shots to the head. The murderers worked in such a way as to make sure that no witnesses were left alive. According to the

experts, the attack was prepared painstakingly and professionally. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] What information is there so far from the experts?

[Kurkletite] There is nothing definite yet. In the first place, a Lithuanian Republic Government commission has been set up. The incident is being investigated by the best specialists of the procurator general of the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs. The experts are not yet giving their conclusions. [passage omitted]

The information service of the Lithuanian Supreme Council today also rejected what it regards as false allegations that clashes took place between the two sides at Medininkai, on the border between Lithuania and Belorussia. In general, many people are inclined to regard the carnage at Medininkai as political killings, although the murderers actually crept up surreptitiously from a corn field. [passage omitted]

Demonstrators Blame Communists

PM0208092691 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Aug 91 First Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Ziyeminsh report from Vilnius under the "Direct Line" rubric and the general heading: "Tragedy at Customs Post"]

[Text] Local television has repeatedly shown pictures of the aftermath of the bloody drama that was played out here on the night of 30-31 July at the Medininkai border post on the Lithuanian-Belorussian border. Six people died from bullet and knife wounds; the youngest was 21 and the oldest 47. Four were police officers, two were customs officers. They were all carrying out their duties. Two more were hospitalized, one of them in a very serious condition. According to the latest information, he later died.

Who committed this vile murder, and to what end? That question concerns many people today. And the answer should be supplied by the investigation, in which, apart from representatives of USSR and Lithuanian law enforcement organs, highly experienced investigators from Belorussia and Latvia are also taking part.

What are the initial results? According to brief accounts from the wounded men, all the killers were armed with automatic weapons.

According to certain other reports, marks left by a track-laying vehicle were found in the vicinity of the customs post, but it is not yet clear whether these have anything to do with the bloody tragedy.

Judging by a watch that was found on the wrist of one of the dead men, which stopped after being hit by a bullet, the tragedy occurred at about 0430 hours.

A "protest rally" was held in Vilnius near the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee building. Among

the participants were many Lithuanians from abroad, here for the pan-Lithuanian Olympics. It seems very strange that this rally was held outside the republic Communist Party Central Committee building. Many of the demonstrators, not mincing their words, called the Communist Party the "ideological inspirer of the bloody act" on the Lithuanian-Belorussian border. Although very little has yet been established as fact, some people are clearly already in a hurry to "make" politics out of the tragedy...

In connection with the border incident, the Lithuanian Parliament has met for an emergency session, having previously announced its dispersal for the summer vacation. A day of mourning has been declared in the republic for 3 August.

IZVESTIYA on Aftermath of Killings

LD0208104991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Aug 91 Union Edition p 2

[Correspondent N. Lashkevich report: "Echo of Tragedy in Lithuania"]

[Text] The criminal and unprecedentedly brutal attack on the customs post at Medininkai on the Lithuanian-Belorussian border has stunned Lithuania. A day of mourning has been called in the republic for Saturday 3 August, the day of the funerals.

As IZVESTIYA has already reported, the incident last Wednesday night claimed six victims. It is likely that the policemen and customs officials on duty at that tragic hour were literally gunned down. Doctors assert that they were shot in the head at close range, as the nature of the fatal wounds attests. One of the customs officials who survived is in an extremely serious condition: A bullet entered the back of his head and passed right through. The wounded men are under strict guard (by all accounts, they are the only witnesses to the tragedy and the investigation is counting on their testimony). Journalists are not allowed in to see them. A large quantity of bullets and spent cartridges from automatic guns were found at the scene of the incident at Medininkai. It has come to the light that the police were armed with three automatic rifles and two pistols but, by all accounts, either did not have time or were unable to offer resistance probably because of the surprise nature of the attack. All the weapons were seized by the attackers.

The circumstances of the tragedy in Medininkai are being investigated by a special investigation group from the Lithuanian Republic Prosecutor's Office. It is not yet known who actually committed this act of brutal violence. At the moment, however, there are two main versions cited by V. Landsbergis during a press conference on Wednesday.

The first version is based on the experience of past months: In May there was a series of attacks on customs posts in various border regions of Lithuania, Medininkai among them. The Special Purpose Militia Detachment [OMON] was actively involved in these actions. The second version

presumes that the terrorist act was committed by mafia groupings who had decided to settle scores with the customs officials who had earned their displeasure by strictly monitoring the export and import of goods.

The Vilnius OMON categorically denies that it took part in the action. The Lithuanian Communist Party, which has also been accused of inciting similar incidents, as shown most clearly during the mass picketing of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee building Wednesday, has resolutely dissociated itself from terror tactics. M. Burokevicius, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, appealed to the republic's inhabitants not to yield to provocation and accused quasifascist groups of organizing the crime.

Virtually all the opposing political forces link the tragic incident with the Moscow summit but place a different interpretation on events. On Thursday the Lithuanian Parliament held a special emergency session to discuss the activity of "terrorist and repressive structures of the USSR in Lithuania."

A. Butkevicius, general director of the territorial defense department, in a television interview also stressed the political character of the crime, which was aimed at increasing tension in the republic.

In all probability, the protection of customs posts and border points will be sharply intensified from this day on.

Center Branded Responsible

PM0208110591 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA
in Russian 2 Aug 91 p 1

[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA political observer Igor Korolkov commentary: "The Tragedy in Lithuania Was Inevitable"]

[Text] Of all the reports of the bloody carnage at the Medininkai customs post I was most struck by the report carried by the "Vremya" program: B. Pugo, USSR minister of internal affairs, is shocked by what happened. The cynicism of some of our top officials does indeed know no bounds! Obviously, he did not entertain the idea that he personally bore the lion's share of the blame for the nocturnal tragedy.

You might have thought that the murder of Lithuanians came as a great surprise to him. You might have thought that he knew nothing about the regular attacks on customs posts over the last few months. The republic leadership has issued a statement and the mass media have expressed indignation at MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] tyranny. But what did he, the minister, do? Did he think that OMON [Special-Purpose Militia Detachment] personnel were thus restoring Soviet power in a Lithuania that has "gone too far"? Attacks have followed one after the other and he, the minister, has kept quiet and by his silence encouraged crime. When the Latvian leadership demanded that Moscow remove

the unrestrained Riga OMON from the republic after a series of terrorist acts, did he disband it?

The "Vremya" program said nothing about the mental state of USSR Prosecutor General N. Trubin. Quite possibly tomorrow he too will display sincere indignation at what happened tomorrow. I write "display" because I do not believe in the sincerity of his sentiments. Because he could have stopped the tension fueled by the Army and the MVD from escalating. But he did nothing either. Did the prosecutor general institute proceedings against the OMON men who burned customs posts and beat up customs officers? No! Were the OMON men who attacked the Latvian MVD and killed five people in so doing punished? No! Were the OMON men who captured the Press House in Riga even expelled from MVD organs? No! Were criminal proceedings instituted against the politicians and servicemen who tried to carry out a coup d'etat in Lithuania? No! Was the Lithuanian TV building that troops seized liberated? No! Have the actions of the Communist Party, which employed the "Black Berets," been legally assessed? No!

By their actions and inactivity the people bearing the tremendous burden of power and guarding the law are helping to create in the Baltics the kind of atmosphere where shedding blood is like overturning a beaker of water. Who other than these high-ranking lawyers should know that a crime unpunished results in more crime?

Historical experience shows that gratifying aggressive forces with a view to using them for your own ends ends badly. Sooner or later they turn against the people who nurtured them.

I am convinced that using OMON and troops to compel the Balts to live by USSR laws is fraught with fresh rounds of violence. By encouraging the man with a gun, responsible politicians run the risk of losing control over him.

I can quite easily entertain the idea that neither Pugo, Yazov, nor Kryuchkov knew about the nocturnal bandit attack. But this can only indicate one thing: The gun that they loaded fired without them at a most convenient moment for some people—during the U.S. President's visit to the USSR.

If we go by the logic of the center's actions in the Baltics, today all of us in Russia should expect OMON and military men to be guarding party committees at enterprises and institutions within the next few days. Is that absurd? Yes! But that is what is happening today in the Baltics. The loss of eight lives is the logical result of the policy of force. Is that the only result?

I am struck by the Balts' patience and courage. Despite what other people are pressing for, they are not succumbing to provocation and are not taking up arms. They have chosen the path of nonviolent action and in the eyes of the world community look incomparably morally superior to the people who are trying to "defend socialist values" by any means.

But people's patience is not infinite. Does anyone really want another Nagorno-Karabakh in the country?

Interior Ministry Appeal on Deaths

LD0108203891 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] The Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania has issued an appeal to the officials of the Lithuanian police and internal services, and to all people in Lithuania.

The appeal says: Blood has once again been shed in Lithuania. On 31 July of this year, police and customs officials were murdered at the Medininkai control post. Lithuania lost loyal sons, who in its difficult times, pledged themselves honestly to serve the homeland and the people. To the end, they sacredly discharged their duties.

The perpetrators have not yet been named, but the names of the murderers will become known sooner or later, and they will be unavoidably and deservedly punished. No matter what aims are being pursued by the enemies of the people or of the homeland, they will not succeed in intimidating Lithuania's people and officials, who are defending freedom, democracy, and justice.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania appeals to all its officials and to all people in Lithuania to preserve calm and concentration, and to be united. We are convinced that the bright memory of the police officials Mindaugas Balavakas, Algimantas Juozakas, Juozas Janonis, and Algirdas Kazauskas will be an example of loyalty to their oath and duty.

Mobile Armed Units To Protect Posts

LD0108214691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Belorussian 1930 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] Lithuanian Prime Minister Vagnorius has stated in his interview to the Russian program of independent Lithuanian radio that special mobile armed units will be formed at the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs to circulate along the borders of Lithuania and on its territory with the object of preventing new killings at customs points and to protect customs officers from provocations. A special police detachment will soon be formed.

U.S. Urged To Probe Deaths

OW0208015491 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1130 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Lithuanian Prime Minister, Gedimanas Vagnorius, has called upon the USA to act as intermediary in the organisation of an international commission of experts to look into the crime at the Medininkai customs point.

In a telegram addressed to the President of the United States, George Bush, the Lithuanian premier says that

terrorist acts on Lithuanian territory have not ceased and that units of the special police (OMON) of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs participate in the majority of them.

Mr. Vagnorius hopes that Presidents Bush and Gorbachev will take whatever measures possible to ensure the withdrawal from the republic's territory of the special police units (OMON) together with units of the Soviet army which continue to occupy the Vilnius TV tower and other strategic points in the city.

Party Issues Statement on Attack

LD0208075691 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1758 GMT 1 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazys Uscilla]

[Text] Vilnius, 1 Aug (TASS)—The Democratic Labor Party of Lithuania has accused the Soviet Union of being responsible for the events on the Lithuania-Belorussia border. As was reported, on the night of 31 July, six people were killed and two wounded at the customs post in Medininkai on the border between Lithuania and Belorussia. Commanders of the Special Purpose Militia Unit [OMON] have refuted the assertion that was made in Lithuania about its involvement in this event.

Despite this denial, the Democratic Labor Party of Lithuania today has circulated a statement here in which it accused the Soviet Union of "banditry because the Army and OMON which are subordinate to the state are controlled by it."

Night Passes 'Without Incidents'

LD0208111691 Moscow TASS in English 1040 GMT
2 Aug 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazys Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius August 2 TASS—A spokesman for the Lithuanian Interior Ministry said today the night had passed without particular incidents.

A Health Ministry official told TASS in the morning that both customs officers wounded on July 31 were in a serious condition as before. The ministry has appealed to foreign medical workers with experience in treating gunshot wounds of the brain for consultations.

Just as on Thursday night, crowds of people gathered in the square in front of the Vilnius Sport Palace where the coffins with the bodies of six policemen and customs officers brutally slaughtered by unidentified persons are placed. People came to express condolence to the relatives of the dead. The funeral will take place on Saturday

at the Antakalnis Cemetery where the victims of the January tragic events in Vilnius were buried.

"All the victims died from gun shots in their heads," the Republic's Procurator-General Arturas Paulauskas told a news conference on Thursday night commenting on the results of work of forensic experts.

He told journalists that prosecutors from the Kaliningrad Region of the Russian Federation and representatives of the USSR Procurator-General's Office offered their services in the investigation of this crime.

Lithuanian Vice-Premier Zigmas Vaisvila told the news conference that Lithuania would tighten controls over its borders. "We cannot retreat," he said and added that "the tactics will be changed". Mobile units will be set up to control the movement of people and vehicles into and out of the republic.

Also on Thursday night, Lithuanian Prime Minister Gedimanas Vagnorius held a news conference. He said "well-equipped armed police teams are being set up to control the main roads".

Besides, he said, an additional voluntary police group is being set up to combat organised crime practiced by the Riga and our OMON" [special purpose militia detachment].

On Thursday, acting Lithuanian Interior Minister Marijonas Misiukonis was relieved of his duties at his own request. His powers were vested in the Piatras Liubartas, deputy interior minister and general commissar of the Lithuanian police who was summoned from his annual leave for the purpose.

Acting Minister of Internal Affairs Resigns

OW0208014691 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1130 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Lithuanian Prime Minister, Gedimanas Vagnorius has agreed to Marijonas Misiukonis' request to resign from the post of acting Minister of Internal Affairs in Lithuania. At the same time his deputy, Piatras Liubartas, has been named first deputy minister. "BALTFAX" reports from the Lithuanian mission in Moscow.

Mr. Misiukonis entered the cabinet as a minister under Mrs. Kazimiera Prunskiene. After her resignation in January this year he has been fulfilling the duties of the minister on a temporary basis. Observers comment that recently Mr. Misiukonis, who holds moderate views and supports the independence of Interior Ministry organs, has come in for harsh criticism from the Lithuanian right.

Union Treaty Signing To Begin 20 Aug*OW0208024991 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1830 GMT 1 Aug 91*

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] RSFSR President Boris Yeltsin announced to the press on Thursday after meeting in Moscow Yugoslavia's Premier A. Markovic that the process of signing the new Union treaty will begin August 20. He intimated the first to sign will be Russia and Kazakhstan so that after the Ukraine takes its decision on the treaty, the signing could be completed in September.

The procedure will be held in a festive atmosphere in the Kremlin's St. George's hall. Boris Yeltsin expects the occasion on August 20 to be attended by the USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Yeltsin, Landsbergis on Significance of Treaty*PM0108161591 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA
in Russian 30 Jul 91 p 1*

["Day's Events" report by Yelizaveta Leontyeva: "New Pages in Mutual Relations"]

[Text] Four documents were signed yesterday between the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the Lithuanian Republic in the House of the Soviets on Krasnopresnenskaya Embankment.

B. Yeltsin and V. Landsbergis signed a Treaty on the Fundamentals of Interstate Relations between the RSFSR and the Lithuanian Republic. I. Silayev and G. Vagnorius signed an Agreement on Cooperation in the Economic and Sociocultural Development of the RSFSR's Kaliningrad Oblast and R. Batkayev and A. Dobrovolskas signed an Agreement Between the RSFSR and Lithuanian Governments on Aid for Citizens Invited To Work in Mazeikiai, Lithuania, and in Vsevolzhskiy Rayon, Leningrad Oblast. Foreign Ministers V. Kozyrev and A. Saudargas signed a protocol on establishing RSFSR and Lithuanian plenipotentiary missions in the Lithuanian Republic and the RSFSR respectively.

Addressing journalists after signing the documents, Yeltsin stressed in particular that the treaty recognizes the sides as sovereign states and subjects of international law. We intend, he said, to build our relations with the Lithuanian Republic in a civilized manner—based on recognition of our states' Declarations on Sovereignty, mutual respect for the values and priorities to which our peoples cleave, and the universally recognized principles and norms of international law.

The treaty is particularly important for strengthening guarantees of human rights and freedoms. Lithuania and Russia guarantee their citizens equal rights and freedoms, irrespective of nationality and other differences. It also coordinates the sides' actions in the sphere of migration policy and contains an accord on preparing a special agreement on questions of citizens' resettlement.

The states' plenipotentiary missions to be opened in Moscow and Vilnius are to play a significant role in this.

The economic section of the treaty is exceptionally important. Lithuania and Russia have agreed to develop economic ties on the basis of the most favored nation principle.

I am sure, Yeltsin noted, that the Lithuanian-Russian treaty will act as a spur to the holding of talks with the USSR. It is surprising that they have been marking time for a year now, despite the decisions adopted.

In turn Landsbergis said that the Lithuanian Republic is encountering an equal degree of understanding and an equal degree of support in peacefully restoring its state independence. We are perfectly well aware, he remarked, of what this complex world is like, where understanding of interests is interwoven with the need to observe certain principles. In this complex world we have encountered in the shape of the new Russia and its president a source of hope not only for Lithuania's citizens. This is a highly significant treaty. Its significance extends beyond Lithuania and Russia. Russia serves as a good example for other states en route to a world of greater justice and kindness.

"In you, Mr. President," Landsbergis said in conclusion, "we have encountered true amicability and principledness in politics—qualities that are not often in evidence nowadays."

Report on Yeltsin-Bush Meeting in Moscow*LD0108131391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
in Russian 1200 GMT 31 Jul 91*

[Text] ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA informs its readers about the meeting between Boris Yeltsin and George Bush, which was held at the Kremlin residence of the Russian president. It was a continuation of interstate Russian-American contacts at the top level, which were established in Washington recently. Bush clearly confirmed that these new ties are an unusual phenomenon but justify themselves.

Immediately after the talks and at the request of a ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA correspondent, Andrey Kozyrev, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic minister of foreign affairs, commented on the talks. He noted that Yeltsin and Bush, two democratic leaders, treat each other as normal partners. This infuses a fresh spirit into the Soviet-American relations. In both domestic and foreign policy Boris Yeltsin demonstrated yet again that the Russian leadership is a motor for change both in Russia itself and in the entire Soviet Union. In this sense Mikhail Gorbachev has a good ally and partner for furthering the development of positive processes.

Prokofyev Discusses CPSU, Yeltsin

LD3007200591 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network
in Hungarian 0650 GMT 30 Jul 91

[Interview with Yuriy Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU, by correspondent Zoltan Tamasi, place and date not given; from the "Foreign Political Observer" program—recorded; Prokofyev speaks in Russian with superimposed translation to Hungarian]

[Text] [Tamasi] Yuriy Anatoliyevich, not long before the session of the Central Committee you spoke at a news conference about the serious danger of a party split. Now, after the session, what is your judgement—is the party, or at least its leadership which aligned itself behind Gorbachev and virtually unanimously voted for the general secretary's proposals, unified? Or is it still on the verge of a split?

[Prokofyev] Even on the basis of the plenum's results, I cannot say that the party might be unified. I can only establish that the Central Committee members obeyed the command of sober reason, and did not let the party fall into pieces before the congress. The plenum—and this is not solely my opinion—was the most constructive one from among the Central Committee sessions of the past period. The pipedreams of our political opponents did not materialize. What this constructive approach can facilitate is that the section of the party with a central bent, which is headed by Gorbachev, should not leave the CPSU.

[Tamasi] If we are on the topic of the center, you, in your speech, touched among other things on the reactionary forces, those who weep for the return of the old times. You said it was possible, indeed necessary, that the party should define its position in connection with them—going, if necessary, as far as expelling them. On the basis of what criteria do you envisage this? Would a line be drawn, and those on one side are reactionary, who must be expelled, while those on the other side are believers in renewal, who can remain?

[Prokofyev] It is not possible to do it in that manner, because the end would be a purging in every party organization. Where the orthodox are more numerous, the reformists would be expelled, and vice versa. Even the situation of the centrists would not be secure. A concrete, defined program and organizational statutes are necessary, and if you support it, if you do not oppose it, you remain in the party; if you do not agree with it then it is more expedient to go over to some other political organization.

[Tamasi] If, in the party, we view the democratic currents outside the center, for example the movement Communists for Democracy, which also wishes to form into a party, what will the stance of the CPSU be in connection with them?

[Prokofyev] My belief is that there should exist various currents, platforms, within the party—reform Communists, Communists for Democracy, a Marxist platform—as long as they do not adopt their own organizational forms. The law bans polygamy. Well, in my view belonging to several parties is not accepted, either. If there is a current in the CPSU, well, let it be, but if it forms another party you must decide whether you wish to be a member of the CPSU, or perhaps of the Democratic Party of the Russian Communists.

[Tamasi] Returning to your speech: perhaps you criticized most sharply the draft program outlined by Gorbachev. The body nonetheless almost unanimously voted in favor of the document as the basis for the all-party debate. If it is not a secret, did you vote yes or no?

[Prokofyev] What we voted on was not whether this should be the basis for the debate, but rather whether it should serve as a basis of departure for the final elaboration and subsequent discussion. I also voted in favor of this. Only when the final version is ready will we publish it.

[Tamasi] Remaining with your speech: [words indistinct] the conditions which characterize the economic crisis, everyday life, the political struggle in the Soviet Union, are disregarded. Do you feel there is a chance that the realities will, in the end, be reflected in the program?

[Prokofyev] I count on it, as the Central Committee standpoint for the committees expects a more realistic document, which assesses the current social and political power relations, too—moreover, our place in the world. The greatest debate, however, will undoubtedly be on the party's character, that there should be both active doers and sympathizers in one party. This draft, however, reckons only with the sympathizers, who sympathize with a given ideology. This is wrong: A more resolute, salient membership is necessary.

[Tamasi] There has been a view that this is not so much a draft party program as a draft election program. Do you agree with this?

[Prokofyev] Yes, many people have spoken about this—scholars, such as Denisov, Abalkin.

[Tamasi] And do you agree that this draft is pushing the party toward the social democratic platform?

[Prokofyev] With regard to the structure of the party in the draft, this is not so much a social democratic party, but some sort of incomprehensible form of association. Regarding the rapprochement toward social democracy, this does not alarm me particularly. The tough stance which we represented in the earlier decades, especially before the war, divided the workers' movement, and enabled fascism to come to power. We must find points of contact with the social democratic parties, and take over from them what is useful. They have obtained

enormous experience in functioning in a multiparty system, in parliamentary work, and the CPSU does not have this.

[Tamasi] At the plenum, Mikhail Gorbachev sharply criticized the orthodox, those who weeped for the return of the past. At the same time he said nothing about the Shevardnadze new movement. Can this be regarded as tacit support for Shevardnadze?

[Prokofyev] We can speak not only of tacit, but also of open support. On this I can say that numerous proclaimed objectives of the movement coincide with the objectives of the party in entirety. If we take, as our basis, the objectives of our Moscow Committee, at places verbatim concurrences can be experienced. If they remain a movement, irrespective of who leads them, the cooperation will remain.

However, if they turn into a party, they will have to modify their objectives, because what sense is there in two parties with the same program? Regarding the orthodox, Gorbachev exaggerates the extent to which they are dangerous. For example, the Moscow platform has 70 people. Another issue is that they create a loud noise, but do not constitute a serious political force.

[Tamasi] Let us remain on the subject of the Shevardnadze line. You say there are many joint traits between the new movement and the CPSU. Shevardnadze himself, however, is also open toward the opposition grouping Democratic Russia, and has also raised the prospect of joining it. It is conceivable that a sort of all-people's front might form for reforms, changes, in which the renewed CPSU and the Shevardnadze movement, as well as the Democratic Russia grouping, might all figure?

[Prokofyev] What is at issue here is Gorbachev's going off track regarding principles. There is no chance for there to be such a unified block, as the party struggles for the reform of socialism while the Democratic Russia grouping—Popov, Sobchak and the others—proclaims a change of social system, a process of capitalization.

[Tamasi] Regarding the party's situation in Russia, the plenum and you condemned the decision by Yeltsin which bans political parties' organizations from the state sector. In your view, why is it indispensable that party organizations should also function at the workplaces?

[Prokofyev] It is not even a question of these being indispensable. The CPSU traditionally was organized in the workers' collectives. Every country has its own political traditions; ours is this. The problem with the decision is that it can lead to an increase in absolutism. It can be aimed at the creation of a power system such as, let us say, that of Pinochet in Chile, or that of South Korea before No Tae-u. The decree makes the operation of trade unions contingent on agreement with the workplace administration. It pertains not only to the political parties, but bans the youth organizations, the women's

organizations, the veteran's organizations from the workplaces. The decision is a return to totalitarianism.

[Tamasi] Then how do you explain that the CPSU members do not take an identical stance? For example, Ivan Laptev, who holds an important post in the federal parliament, or the current Communists for Democracy, let by Rutskoy, approve of Yeltsin's decree. Contrary to you, would they not have noticed that it is undemocratic

[Prokofyev] What can I say to this? In my view Laptev will soon leave the CPSU. Rutskoy even said that they should for the time being keep it in the party name that it is communist, but later then can drop it. In truth, they will call themselves communists so that they can maintain a claim to some of the party assets.

[Tamasi] What is your opinion? Is it conceivable that President Gorbachev will in the end not invalidate Yeltsin's decree? Have you prepared for such a development of events?

[Prokofyev] The question, properly speaking, is two questions. With regard to Gorbachev, the country's justice minister pointed out where Yeltsin's decree conflicts with the Constitution. So if Yeltsin's decree comes into force, Gorbachev will not have fulfilled his obligation, as he took his oath on the Soviet Constitution. Gorbachev must decide. It is apparent that if he leaves Yeltsin to realize the decision, his esteem within the party will considerably decrease.

With regard to the second question: The city committee is ready to continue work under all circumstances, even underground. For example, as an experiment we are organizing together representatives of various professions in a set of districts, on a territorial basis—health care workers or, as in the (?Krasnatsvetsky) District, party members in the forces of law and order.

Thus we have experience. We can set up party clubs and organizations functioning on a professional basis in individual areas. However, we will not toss about the communists according to residence. We shall try to preserve the existing collectives.

Khasbulatov Interviewed on Changes in RSFSR

LD0208092191

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1543 GMT on 1 August carries a 15-minute "Russian Parliamentary Herald" program segment entitled "What Is the Government Going To Be Like?" The program features a recorded interview with Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] deputy and candidate for RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman, by Sergey Nosovets, a journalist and a deputy of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Nosovets opens by talking about the new presidential structure. He asks how that is affecting the work of parliament, and Khasbulatov in particular. Khasbulatov

says that the establishment of new presidential structures is a way of improving all three types of power—executive, legislative, and judicial. Due to the energy of Yeltsin, it is likely that the parliament will soon have many more legislative acts to pass. Khasbulatov states: "It is quite another matter that the point here will be the need for more precise planning so that there will be more attention directed to essential legislative acts such as laws, decrees, and other resolutions of the Supreme Soviet and its presidium." He stresses the need for the Supreme Soviet to concentrate both on its law-making functions and on its monitoring and controlling functions.

Nosovets then refers to the budget, which remains the responsibility of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet presidium. Khasbulatov confirms the importance of this role. This is to be the first issue discussed when the Supreme Soviet commences its work on 17 September. Even during the break, the presidium, committees, and commissions are all still working. Khasbulatov stresses that the Supreme Soviet is to work in conjunction with the government structures to pass the necessary legislative acts, and then to ensure that they are implemented. He further stresses the need for Russia not to act in isolation, but to coordinate its actions with the actions of other republics and the union authorities. He says: "The Russian Supreme Soviet also needs to coordinate its actions to a greater extent both with the Union parliament and with the parliaments of other Union republics, at least within the framework of the Novo-Ogarevo agreement."

Nosovets then raises the issue of Yeltsin's decree on departization, which has aroused strong feelings and which opponents have called anticonstitutional. Khasbulatov replies: "Well, of course, some speeches were to be expected in reaction to this decree, but I would like to repeat that it was adopted in strict accordance with the Russian Constitution." Khasbulatov goes on to express his bewilderment at all the fuss aroused by the decree as "this does not only concern the activities of the CPSU or the Russian Communist Party, but, practically speaking, it concerns other parties too. At the same time, the decree is not directed against public organizations, trade unions, women's groups, youth and sport organizations, and so on, nor against the hundreds of different creative organizations and associations, so it cannot be viewed as being directed against human rights. On the contrary, the point is that we do need to stop elements of a state party. The CPSU is a state structure and a state party. If we really want to turn the CPSU into a real public political force, then this decree offers additional opportunities for it to take its form as a public political force rather than as a state party."

Khasbulatov then refers to his recent visit to Britain. To highlight the need for change within the CPSU, he mentions that the Labour Party leadership has less than 100 people. This, in the view of Khasbulatov, is what the CPSU should be aiming for.

In conclusion, Nosovets asks how the Supreme Soviet will react if the president issues a decree that contradicts RSFSR legislation. Khasbulatov stresses that they will oppose any such decree if it contradicts RSFSR legislation.

Decree Announces Ministerial Appointments

PM0108155691 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA
in Russian 31 Jul 91 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Appointments"]

[Text] By decree of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president, Viktor Pavlovich Barannikov is appointed RSFSR minister of internal affairs.

By decree of the RSFSR president, Sergey Borisovich Stankevich is appointed RSFSR state adviser for collaboration with social associations.

By decree of the RSFSR president, Valentin Mikhaylovich Sergeyev is appointed plenipotentiary representative of the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, with the rank of RSFSR minister.

Yakovlev Named Moscow Public Assembly Chairman

LD0108185591 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT
1 Aug 91

[Text] Moscow August 1 TASS—Former senior aid to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev Academician Aleksandr Yakovlev has been appointed chairman of the Moscow Public Assembly, today's Soviet governmental newspaper IZVESTIYA reports.

The assembly will gather representatives of all parties and various public factions in governing councils to accumulate the interests and needs of Muscovites and submit them to Moscow's government for implementation, Yakovlev said.

Moscow City Council Chairman Views Privatization

OW0208044991 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1100 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Two bodies will carry out the process of privatizing Moscow's property and production base, city council officials told newsmen on Thursday. There are the present executive committee for managing state property which will monitor privatisation work, and Moscow's Property Fund belonging to representative power which will act as the seller of municipal property. Besides, there are plans to set up a committee for controlling the spending of funds received as a result of privatisation.

When asked by IF's [INTERFAX's] correspondent about the prospects and scope of involving foreign

capital in the efforts to develop the city, the chairman of the Moscow city council Nikolai Gonchar said that to indicate the concrete amount of investment now is impossible, since it includes real investment and written pledges to invest funds on condition of ensuring social stability and legal guarantees. According to Gonchar, the main difficulty lies in the "absence of a unified juridical language, when the lawyers of foreign companies often fail to understand our lawyers". The scope of foreign investment, said Gonchar, will depend directly on what guarantees are secured by the city council.

To refute the circulating rumours N. Gonchar declared officially that "there is no confrontation between the Moscow city council and the mayor's office."

Murmansk Obkom Plans 'Underground Work'

PM0108131191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
27 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[IAN report: "Obkom Prepared To Go Underground"]

[Text] The Murmansk RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Obkom [oblast committee] Bureau, no longer counting on help from "above," has set about devising new ways for its committees and cells to work if the decree on departyization does actually come into force. A regrouping of the entire party structure along territorial lines is being allowed to take place. However, the obkom is not going to tolerate the severance of its links with labor collectives and is prepared to switch to underground work in collectives and to use leaflets as a means of campaigning.

IAN reports that the obkom's actions in the event of extreme situations, such as the seizure of its premises or other encroachments on the party's property, are also being studied.

Leningrad Council Drafts Sovereignty Project

OW0208051491 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1100 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The leaders of the Leningrad city council together with its commission on Legislation published on Wednesday the draft of provisional status of Leningrad (St. Petersburg). According to IF's [INTERFAX's] correspondent, the draft was submitted to general discussions. It is expected to be approved by the city council this autumn.

The document proclaims Leningrad as "a subject of the Russian Federation enjoying all powers of a republic stipulated in the federal agreement and in the legislation of the Russian Federation". Under the draft "the basis of Leningrad's state system will be established and changed on the basis of Leningrad's constitution".

The draft status includes a provision on the city's territorial integrity. Under it the city council will be structurally reorganized, up to setting up within it a standing legislative chamber (senate) that will include 100 city council deputies working on professional basis.

There will be an inspection chamber designed to monitor compliance with the laws of Leningrad, the Russian Federation and the USSR. The city council's presidium will engage in exclusively coordinating work. It will be accountable to sessions held by the city council and to Leningrad's senate. Leningrad's state services: courts of law, prosecutor's office and the police will be placed under the jurisdiction of the city authorities.

The draft provides for introducing Leningrad's "state symbols". It is suggested that the traditional emblem of St. Petersburg: a gold double headed eagle in the center of a white, blue and red colour cloth should serve as the city's emblem. Blier's work called "Glory to the Great City" is suggested to serve as the city's anthem.

Ukraine

President Bush Pays Visit to Ukraine 1 Aug

Bush Arrives in Kiev

LD0108104191 Moscow TASS in English 1005 GMT
1 Aug 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS special correspondents Alexey Petrunya and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Kiev August 1 TASS—U.S. President George Bush, who is visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, arrived in Kiev, capital of the Ukrainian Republic, today.

He was welcomed at the Borispol airport, where the national flags of the United States, the USSR and the Ukrainian Republic were flying, by chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Leonid Kravchuk, the republic's prime minister Vitold Fokin and other officials.

According to the ancient Slavic tradition, a girl and a young man wearing national costumes welcomed the American President with bread and salt.

Thousands of Kievans lined the streets along which the motorcade with President Bush, the chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, Ukrainian prime minister and Soviet Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev, who accompanies George Bush on his trip, sped from the airport to the city centre. The ancient city that originated a thousand and a half years ago gave a warm welcome to the visiting dignitaries.

During his one-day visit to Kiev, George Bush is expected to have a one-on-one conversation with the head of the republican parliament, hold official talks with Leonid Kravchuk and Vitold Fokin, address Ukrainian parliament and cabinet members and representatives of political parties and public organisations. He will be shown around the city and visit the gem of ancient Russian architecture—the cathedral of Saint Sophia—and the Babi Yar holocaust memorial, a place where thousands of Soviet citizens were shot and killed by Nazi invaders during the Second World War.

President George Bush is due to leave for the United States late today.

Kravchuk Welcomes Bush at Airport

LD0108152191 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian
0950 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Speech by Leonid Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, at a welcome ceremony for U.S. President George Bush on arrival in Kiev on 1 August—live]

[Text] Dear Mr. President, dear Mrs. Bush, ladies and gentlemen, comrades:

Today we cordially welcome a prestigious guest on Ukrainian soil—the President of a great power, the United States of America, George Bush, and his wife. Our sincere and hearty welcome is also addressed to the well-known U.S. statesmen and those accompanying the President.

Mr. President, we attach great significance to your visit to the Ukraine and hope that it will go down in history as an important step in an appraisal of the situation that has come about in our country and in the political and socio-economic spheres.

Your visit reflects the changes that have recently taken place in our countries, in international relations, and in the world as a whole. Despite the complexity and contradictory nature of political processes, radical positive changes are a significant feature of world development today. For these changes mankind should primarily thank the sweeping policy of our states and their joint aspiration for humane and just peace.

The fact that you came to our republic immediately after signing a document of historic significance in Moscow, the treaty on reducing strategic offensive weapons, is especially pleasing. The people of the Ukraine believe this is another concrete step toward realizing universal and full disarmament, and toward building a world without weapons and without wars.

Your visit to the Ukraine is taking place at a difficult time for the republic, but on the basis of the declaration on state sovereignty and thanks to the aspirations for national accord, step by step the Ukraine is moving along the road to sovereignty and consolidating stability and civil peace. Some 52 million Ukrainians, Russians, Jews, Poles, and Bulgarians live and work amicably in the Ukraine. For all of them, the soil of the Ukraine is their native soil.

We have embarked firmly on the road to democracy and a market economy. The majority of people support us today. The United States, which adopted the Declaration of Independence and which was one of the first countries to proclaim to the whole world the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity, knows the price of real sovereignty and will understand our longing and the will of the people of the Ukraine.

Taking into account political and economic realities, we are conducting a course to form a new Union, a Union of sovereign states, and to strengthen and further develop equal ties with all republics. This course is supported by the people. Various political forces are consolidating around it.

In the international arena, the Ukraine aspires to attain the status of a member in the international community, with full rights, and to integrate its economy into the world economy.

Mr. President, we attach sincere hopes to your visit for establishing direct relations between the Ukraine and the

United States. The first bricks have already been laid for the foundation. We hope that after your stay in the Ukraine visits from U.S. businessmen will follow. We will create all the economic and legal international conditions for their fruitful work.

I sincerely welcome, Mr. President and Mrs Bush, and all members of the American delegation, to the hospitable soil of the Ukraine. I say to you: Laskavo Prosymo [traditional form of welcome for guests meaning: We graciously bid you welcome]. [applause]

Official Talks Held

LD0108164791 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] Kiev August 1 TASS—During his conversation with Ukrainian Supreme Soviet President Leonid Kravchuk here today, George Bush was told about the Ukraine's stance on the new Union treaty.

Kravchuk pointed out that the Ukraine wants to live in peace and friendship with the other republics and build relations with them on a mutually beneficial basis.

He also said that the Ukraine would like to raise the issue of expanding its participation in European and worldwide structures with the United Nations' assistance.

The American President heard the Ukrainian Government's proposals regarding a number of specific projects to promote economic cooperation with the United States, including the granting of most-favoured-nation trading status to the Ukraine as a subject of international law.

The sides also discussed issues of increasing American investments against guarantees of the National Ukrainian Bank and participation of American companies in the denationalisation of several enterprises in the republic's mining, steel and other industries.

Expanded Talks Noted

LD0108154491 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1400 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] Following George Bush's arrival in the capital of the Ukraine today, a one-to-one conversation began in the Mariinskiy Palace between the U.S. President and Leonid Kravchuk, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

Then there were expanded talks with the participation of Prime Minister Vitold Fokin and other representatives of the republic. They discussed questions concerning the possibility of the development of direct ties between the Ukraine and the United States.

The U.S. President addressed the republic's Supreme Soviet.

Bush Introduced at Supreme Soviet

LD0108180291 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 1255 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Opening speech by Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk prior to U.S. President George Bush's speech at the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet in Kiev—live; monitored in progress]

[Text] ...One of the initiators of the creation of the new Union—the union of sovereign states in which every republic would be a subject of international law and would take an active part in all European and world affairs, and that all forces, all political forces in the Ukraine unite on precisely these principles of sovereignty, unity, brotherhood, friendship, and cooperation with republics and with other states. Precisely this ensures stability for us. All people present today in this hall and outside this hall are representatives of all nations and ethnic groups but they live in our Ukraine on their native land, and the Ukrainian land is a warm and sheltered home for them. This stabilizes our work and here our prospects for the future open up.

I give the floor to George Bush, president of the United States.

Bush's Speech Summarized

LD0108155591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] The visit of U.S. President George Bush to Kiev continues. Our special correspondent, Andrey Trapeznikov, reports from the capital of the Ukraine:

[Trapeznikov] Speaking in parliament, the U.S. President first thanked the people of the Ukraine for the warm reception given to him and other members of the delegation. He said there is only one thing he is sorry about—the visit is coming to an end this evening as tomorrow the U.S. Congress finishes its work.

From the very beginning the President made the reservation that his speech should not be regarded as a lecture or a notation, he simply wants to share his views on the processes taking place in our country. You are facing a difficult task, George Bush said, for many years the administration bodies did not have real power on the one hand, on the other hand they were controlling all aspects of the Soviet people's life.

How does the United States see the future of our country? It believes that there will be both central and republican governments. The United States will be supporting those who advocate democracy at both the center and locally, but we must decide ourselves how we carry out transformations as it is our internal affair, and the United States will not interfere in this process.

Some people in my motherland, the president said, try to persuade people to support either Gorbachev or his opponents. Gorbachev, in the opinion of George Bush,

has achieved great success in perestroika, glasnost, and democratization, but the United States cannot ignore the realities—the realities with regard to the fact that independent republics already exist, and they want to maintain and develop relations with them.

What is freedom in the American sense of the word? Americans, George Bush said, live without fearing the interference of the government in their affairs. Their freedoms are not encroached upon by other citizens, and they do not infringe on the rights of their compatriots. Freedom is the property of all people—men and women—and not of individual parties and political leaders. By the way, in the opinion of George Bush, the number of people engaged in the secret services is a peculiar indicator of freedom.

Freedom and democracy also depend on economic freedom. A free economy makes people work, but it cannot function without legislation, hence laws protecting property and rights of citizens are needed. Today some oblasts and republics, the President said in this connection, have joined a real economic war. In his opinion, a republic should not follow an unstoppable course toward self-isolation, because on the one hand it leads to the disruption of economic ties between them, and on the other hand it prevents Western entrepreneurs, in particular those from the United States, from conducting normal economic cooperation. They must have guarantees that their investments will be protected.

Speaking about the situation in our country, George Bush said that, of course, it is impossible to change the entire system overnight. The country is moving to the free society that has existed in the United States for 200 years.

In conclusion George Bush addressed the parliamentarians of the Ukraine as well as perhaps parliamentarians of all other Supreme Soviets in all republics. He said that many people, Soviet people, are demoralized now by decades of totalitarian regime, and he called on the deputies to help them and to restore their confidence in their abilities.

Kravchuk Thanks Bush for Speech

LD0108173991 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian
1311 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Closing remarks by Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk following the speech by U.S. President George Bush at the Ukraine Supreme Soviet in Kiev—live]

[Text] Esteemed Mr President, permit me to express sincere thanks for the thoughts that you have shared with us. I am convinced that they synthesize the great road toward democracy, pluralism and liberalization, traversed by the United States.

For all of us in this hall it was very touching that in order to affirm your faith in democracy and your faith in freedom you referred to our great bard-kobzar. For us this

is not only a spiritual value, but also the sign of your great respect for the history of the Ukraine and the history of our people. We hope that this drawing of support from history and belief in these ideals, which you also outlined in this hall today, will give us additional strength to march along the road to sovereignty.

I would like, Mr. President, with your permission to allow myself a brief joke. In this hall we have been working for more than a year, in fact for one year and three months. Never before has this hall been filled with so many people nor has it known such silence. [laughter and applause] I thought what a great help it would be to me if you came here more often and joined our proceedings. [applause]

I would like to thank you once more, Mr. President, for your attention. The President and his delegation still have to go through an extremely difficult program. All the best! [applause]

Bush Tours Kiev

LD0108143491 Moscow TASS in English 1356 GMT
1 Aug 91

[By TASS special correspondents Alexey Petrunya and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Kiev August 1 TASS—U.S. President George Bush toured the Ukrainian capital of Kiev today, after addressing the republic parliament.

Kiev, dubbed "the mother of Russian cities" was founded more than 1,500 years ago and was the centre of Kievan Russia.

In 1240, the city was ruined by Mongolian-Tartar hordes, but was rebuilt from scratch, becoming even more beautiful.

The invading Nazis turned the city into ruins during the Second World War. It was once again rebuilt and expanded and is now often called one of Europe's most charming cities.

It is a large industrial, scientific and cultural centre with a population of more than 2.5 million. It has an academy of sciences and 19 higher educational establishments, including a university with more than 20,000 students.

Ancient, gold-domed churches are among its treasures, including such dazzling pieces of medieval architecture as the golden gates, the Kiev-Pechora Laura and St. Sophia's cathedral.

Bush visited St. Sophia's cathedral, the pearl of 11th century architecture, today, to take a look at its fascinating old mosaics and frescoes, including a group portrait of Grand Duke of Kiev Yaroslav the Wise and his family.

Grand Dukes Yaroslav the Wise, Vladimir Monomakh and others are buried in the cathedral. Last year it was included in the UNESCO list of international cultural heritage.

Remarks at Babi Yar Memorial Cited

LD0108161891 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] Kiev August 1 TASS—In his remarks during wreathlaying at Babi Yar memorial U.S. President said that Babi Yar—the site of mass shooting of Soviet citizens by the Nazis during the Second World War—reminds people of the genocide against Jews, the slaughter of gypsies, the wanton murder of communists, Christians—of anyone who dared question the Nazi madman's fantasies.

"Here we think about people of great promise and talent—young men and women, who would have become doctors or physicists, athletes or artists, mothers, fathers. All died because a maniac in Berlin wanted to exterminate their kind," the President said.

Party Prepares Letter for Bush

LD0108155491 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 0950 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] The leadership of the Ukrainian Republican Party has prepared a letter addressed personally to President George Bush. The party welcomes his arrival and at the same time expresses the wish for the U.S. President not to use his stay in the Ukraine to persuade it, in whatever way, to quickly sign the Union treaty.

Bush Departs Kiev

LD0108162691 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 1 Aug 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS special correspondents Aleksey Petrunya and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Kiev August 1 TASS—U.S. President George Bush left the Ukrainian capital Kiev today. He was in the Soviet Union on an official visit from July 29 to August 1. At Borispol Airport, Bush was seen off by USSR Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev, Ukrainian Supreme Soviet President Leonid Kravchuk, Republic Prime Minister Vitold Fokin and other officials.

Kravchuk Calls Visit 'Fruitful'

LD0108203991 Moscow TASS in English 2000 GMT 1 Aug 91

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Ivan Sayk]

[Text] Kiev August 1 TASS—Ukrainian parliamentary leader Leonid Kravchuk has called talks with U.S. President George Bush interesting and fruitful.

In an interview with UKRINFORM-TASS after the President's departure he said that they "discussed large direct U.S. investments into the republic's economy and the participation of the United States in economic assistance to the republic".

"The U.S. President noted that these issues have yet to be studied, but I can say that he does not see any difficulties in this respect," Kravchuk said.

Kravchuk believes Bush is satisfied with his visit to the Ukraine. Residents of Kiev gave a cordial welcome to him and paid respect to his country, its policy and international authority.

"The U.S. President could feel this, and we spoke about prospects for developing contacts between Ukrainian and U.S. businessmen in order to reach a new quality of bilateral relations.

"But we have got to understand that speaking about those is premature unless we settle our internal problems and perfect our society," Kravchuk said.

"We should put our home in order and complete forming our political structures and implementing economic prognoses, as the U.S. President said. We should do this in accordance with a formula, which I have repeatedly mentioned,—the Ukraine must become a sovereign power in the Union of sovereign states," Kravchuk said.

Preview Discusses Impact of Bush Visit

LD0108160991 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 31 Jul 91

[Excerpts] [Announcer] President George Bush will arrive in Kiev tomorrow [1 August]. Last touches have been put on for receiving the exalted guest. Many foreign and soviet journalists have been granted official accreditation to cover the Ukrainian part of the American leader's visit. Among them is our special correspondent Oles Bedzyk.

Meanwhile, we are going to present to you several brief interviews with Kievites conducted this evening in the center of the city. I asked them the same question: How do you assess Bush's visit to the Ukraine?

[unidentified woman] I think this is support for the Ukraine in an international aspect. I would like to regard it as their seeing us as an equal partner and independent state.

[unidentified man] You know, many Ukrainians are U.S. citizens. That probably made some impact on American politicians, and they responded with some positive decisions regarding the Ukraine.

[Unidentified second man] My attitude to Western statesmen's visit to the Ukraine is rather restrained.

They only pursue their own interests. Of greatest importance to them is business, and all other questions come later. When the empire was strong, they tried to defend human rights in the Soviet Union. Now all they care about is preserving the very same empire. It is high time for Western politicians to understand that only paying attention to Union republics, seeing them as future sovereign states, can produce the necessary result. [passage omitted]

[announcer] You know, on a political plane we have not achieved genuine democracy yet, while the United States is regarded as the largest continent of democracy. Would you like Bush to mentor the Ukraine on how it should live and behave?

[Unidentified female] I think that all friendly advice from Western leaders should be accepted. Advice, but not hectoring.

[Unidentified man] Of course it is advisable for us to learn the experience of Western countries. But it does not mean that we have to copy them blindly. We have many good traditions of our own developed as far back as the 18th century.

[Unidentified second man] I believe this visit will be of great importance if Mr. Bush helps Western politicians to understand Soviet leaders. And I do not think in a way as perceived by Mrs. Thatcher who compared the Ukraine with California.

Georgia

Foreign Minister Khoshtaria on Independence

OW0208042191 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1710 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Georgian Foreign Minister Georgiy Khoshtaria said in an interview with IF [INTERFAX] that "step by step" his republic moves toward full independence. In his words, now Georgia is passing a transitional period.

Mr. Khoshtaria pointed out that Georgia plans to introduce its own currency, to set up a national bank, customs service and to take control of the borders. However, that will be done in stages, he said.

Mr. Khoshtaria also stressed Georgia's aspiration for dialogue with the center referring to the Georgian parliament's July 30 address to the USSR Supreme Soviet which confirmed its readiness to sit at negotiating table with the Soviet leadership.

Speaking about Georgia's relations with Armenia and Azerbaijan, Mr. Khoshtaria said that they are aimed at stabilizing the situation in this highly tense region. In his words, the signing of the treaties recently signed by Georgia with both republics is the first step on this way.

The complete text of Mr. Khoshtaria's interview with IF will be published in "NATION AND SOCIETY" in the near future.

Premier Supports Kazakhstan Initiative

OW0208062391 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1430 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In an interview with local television the Georgian Prime Minister, Tengiz Sigua, announced that he wholeheartedly supports the initiative of Kazakh President, Nursultan Nazarbayev, to introduce horizontal economic links between the fifteen sovereign republics.

Mr. Nazarbayev first mooted the idea of a meeting of all fifteen republican leaders to discuss urgent economic issues, such as food supply, and the supply of fuel in winter, in an interview with Moscow television about a month ago. He suggested that such a meeting take place in Alma Ata.

For his part, Mr. Sigua suggested to Mr. Nazarbayev that the first meeting of the republican representatives be held in Tbilisi.

Paper on Charges Military Provoked Incidents

PM0108150591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 27 Jul 91 First Edition p 2

[Report by Colonel L. Arshantsev: "Response From the District Military Commander"]

[Text] Tbilisi—Clashes between the local population and servicemen took place in Sukhumi 20 July and Tbilisi 21 July. The Transcaucasus Military District military prosecutor, in conjunction with the territorial law enforcement organs, has opened an investigation into each incident. Nevertheless, in a letter addressed to the military district commander, Georgian President Z. Gamsakhurdia was quick to accuse the military of "inhuman action and provoking conflict."

In his reply Colonel General V. Patrikeyev stresses that he does not believe it is possible to blame any one side until the official investigation is complete. However, in the military district commander's opinion, one circumstance warrants attention: According to verified information from the prosecutor's organs of the Transcaucasus Military District and the Republic of Georgia, the incident in Sukhumi resulted from an attempt by civilians to rape the wife of one of the servicemen, and the organization of mass disturbances in the Abkhaz ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] capital was aimed at preventing the arrest of the offenders. The letter states: "By using unverified information, the republic media have actually provoked fresh tension in mutual relations between citizens of the Georgian Republic and servicemen and members of their families. On 23 July a military vehicle was set on fire on Rustaveli Boulevard in downtown Tbilisi. Once again I would like to draw your attention to the urgent and vital need in the current difficult atmosphere to observe the utmost restraint and wisdom and to reject the propagation of any form of unverified or knowingly false information through the press, radio, or television...."

It is worth adding that despite the commander's reply, the republic media continue to fuel anti-Army passions regarding these incidents. One gets the impression that certain forces in the republic are trying in this way to achieve quite specific political aims.

Turks in Georgia Demonstrate Over Homeland Issue

LD0208073291 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 2000 GMT 1 Aug 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] [Reporter O. Yukht] Yesterday Meskhetian Turks continued to picket the USSR Supreme Soviet reception offices on Manezh Square. They have not had a homeland for more than 45 years. When, as a result of the Fergana valley events, the majority of Meskhetians were forced to leave their homes in Uzbekistan, the question of their settlement became particularly acute. All the

steps undertaken by the center so far have not solved the problem. A fairly paradoxical situation has arisen.

The decision to deport the Meskhetian Turks from Georgia in 1944 was made by the USSR Supreme Soviet. From this there follows the evident conclusion that the question of their fate must be decided by the country's highest legislative body, which is what the demonstrators are demanding. [video shows demonstration on Manezh Square, with demonstrators holding banners bearing slogans such as "Return our Homeland to Us," "We Will Preserve Our Nation, Honor, and Dignity," and chanting slogans]

[B. Abulfaz, member of the Central Council of "Fatherland" society] When we, Georgian comrades, appealed to the leadership, they said that we did not deport you, but you were deported by the Union, so let the Union decide this.

[Yukht] It is not excluded that the Georgian government will view such a step as interference in the republic's internal affairs.

[K. Lomaya, acting permanent Georgian government representative in Moscow] I would say that the settlement of the Turks in Georgia is a matter for the sovereign Georgian state. But I do not exclude that along the path to solutions there must be some consultations, including with the USSR authorities. [video shows Lomaya being interviewed in office]

[Yukht] On 30 July three representatives of the Fatherland Society set off for Georgia for talks at the invitation of the republican government.

Armenia

'Revival' of Terrorist Organization Noted

PM0108143591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 26 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

["Our Digest" feature citing interview with Major General A. Karbainov, chief of the USSR KGB Public Relations Center, published in PRAVITELSTVENNIY VESTNIK No. 30: "What They Are Saying, What They Are Writing"]

[Text] From an interview with Major General A. Karbainov, chief of the USSR KGB Public Relations Center:

"It cannot be said that the violence in the country is directly inspired or connected with the activity of particular terrorist groups abroad. However, these groups have markedly stepped up activity hostile to the USSR....

"Events in Nagorno-Karabakh have brought to mind the so-called Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia (ASALA), which since 1975 has been notorious for its terrorist actions against missions and citizens of Turkey and its allies.

"At present, all the indications are that a revival of this organization is under way. For instance, in its program statement in January 1991 ASALA regards one of the tasks of its activity as being to help Armenia gain full independence. And its leaders do not rule out armed struggle to achieve their goal.

"Where do the terrorists get their money? It is mostly money collected ostensibly for charitable purposes. Food and clothing received from humanitarian aid funds in view of the earthquake have been confiscated in large quantities from the gunmen detained on NKAO territory." (PRAVITELSTVENNIY VESTNIK, No. 30.)

National-Democratic Alliance Formed

LD0208035891 Moscow TASS in English 1347 GMT
1 Aug 91

[Text] Yerevan August 1 TASS—Armenian Prime Minister Vazgen Manukyan and three of his supporters on Wednesday announced the founding of the Armenian National-Democratic Alliance, a political organisation.

Their statement published here points out that the Alliance is not a party and will seek to unite political organisations operating in the republic and individuals on the basis of the common national ideology and around tackling national tasks.

The authors of the statement believe that the path pursued by the republic can be disastrous for the people. They warn of the danger of the existence of numerous political organisations, which are intolerant towards each other and the majority of which tend to pursue seemingly national but actually social struggle.

Local newspapers commented on this statement as "a split between yesterday like-minded people".

Azerbaijan

Official Views Visit by Russian Deputies

OW0208092391 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1710 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Last Wednesday, People's Deputies of the Russian Federation Anatoliy Shabad, Gleb Ponomarev and Viktor Sheinis arrived in Baku. Vice Chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet and Chairman of the Mejlis of the Popular Front of Azerbaijan, Tamerlan Garayev, told IF [INTERFAX] that "the guests hope to act as mediators in the talks between Armenia and Azerbaijan."

The deputies of the Russian Federation said that they had been authorized to perform their mediatory mission by the presidents of Russia and Kazakhstan, but did not present any official confirmation of what they said.

"I would assess the mission of our guests not as mediatory, but rather as oppositional," said Tamerlan Garayev.

He also said that the people's deputies of the Russian Federation had recognized the existence of Armenian militants and, on their part, urged Azerbaijan to recognize them as a real force.

Tamerlan Garayev confirmed Baku's official position according to which the withdrawal of all Armenian militants from Azerbaijan, the renunciation of interference in the republic's internal affairs and the condemnation of terrorism constitute an indispensable condition for starting any talks with Armenia.

Azerbaijan "welcomes the idea of mediation and its initiators, but secures for itself the right to chose the mediators," Garayev said.

On Wednesday evening, Shabada, Ponomaryov and Sheinis had a meeting with Azerbaijan's President, Ayaz Mutalibov, IF correspondent reports.

Two Farmers Killed in Nagorno-Karabakh

LD0108124291 Moscow TASS in English 1004 GMT 1 Aug 91

[Text] Baku August 1 TASS—Unidentified attackers sprayed a farm car with bullets in Gadrut region in Nagorno-Karabakh on Tuesday, killing two Azerbaijani farmers.

"Armenian nationalists step up activity every time stabilisation and law-enforcement measures are carried out in Nagorno-Karabakh," a spokesman for the republican prosecutor's office told TASS.

In another attack on Wednesday night, five servicemen and a reporter were injured when militants ambushed a military convoy near an Armenian village in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Attackers blocked a convoy of Soviet interior troops heading towards the Azerbaijani village of Imeret-Gerevend in Mardaket district. From [as received].

They then sprayed it with missiles and gunfire, injuring four troops and a journalist from a Perm newspaper. Two armoured personnel carriers were damaged.

The number of people killed in the area has risen to 122 in the first six months of this year, compared to 57 in all of last year, the spokesman said.

Terrorist Group Suspected in Train Blast

LD0108122891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1031 GMT 1 Aug 91

[By correspondent Viktor Shulman]

[Text] Baku, 1 Aug (TASS)—Today officials of the law enforcement bodies of Azerbaijan and Daghestan [in the

Caucasus] started working on versions of the cause of yesterday's blast on a carriage of a Moscow-Baku passenger train. According to preliminary information, as a result of the explosion 14 passengers were killed and 16 were injured.

It was reported by the Azerbaijan transportation procuracy that details will have to be checked on information suggesting that an hour and a half before the blast two unknown people jumped from the carriage while it was moving. Their descriptions have been passed to investigating officials by eyewitnesses. In the opinion of spokesmen for the investigation, it is not ruled out that the explosive device was planted at Mineralnyye Vody station. It was there, it has been learned, that two carriages with numbered reserved seats were coupled to the Moscow-Baku, which originated in Leningrad. One of these two carriages was blown up.

All that is left as a reminder of the sabotage, which occurred early on the morning of 31 July along the Temirgoye-Shamkhal section of track near Makhachkala, are bits of metal facing and wooden racks of the carriage several meters on either side of the track. It is from these fragments that the experts are trying to develop a picture of the incident.

Experts are not ruling out the existence of a terrorist group operating on the North Caucasus Railway. This group may have selected Baku trains as their targets. The idea is based on the fact that this year on this railway there have been three passenger train explosions. The first two happened in February and May.

Mutalibov Says World Misunderstands Republic

LD0108191991 Moscow TASS in English 0938 GMT 01 Aug 91

[Text] Baku August 1 TASS—"If you, Azerbaijan fellow citizens assume the role of a peculiar spiritual bridge between the homeland, the native people and the world public in distributing news about Azerbaijan, in forming an impartial view about its problems, I think results of exceptional importance can be achieved [words indistinct] Ayaz Mutalibov of Azerbaijan writes in his appeal to Azerbaijanians residing abroad. The appeal was today circulated by AZERINFORM in this Transcaucasian Soviet republic's news organisations.

The president is confident that the Western world does not have clear and objective information about the Azerbaijan people, their ancient history and immense cultural treasures that are of importance to the entire humanity. Mutalibov writes that the false and distorted idea about developments in Nagorno-Karabakh as well as about the history of the people in general, their culture, territorial borders and national dignity is being cultivated in the minds of the world public.

Interior Minister Refutes False Information

*LD0108222791 Moscow TASS in English 1701 GMT
1 Aug 91*

[by correspondent Asildar Guseynov]

[Text] Baku August 1 TASS—Azerbaijani Interior Minister Mamed Asadov has denied reports by the ARMENPRESS news agency in the national TV news programme Vremya on Wednesday that people deported from the Armenian villages of Erkech and Tsamdzor in Azerbaijan began guerrilla operations against Azerbaijan.

The report says that on June 29, 1991, deported residents attacked an Azerbaijani OMON detachment, which occupied their villages, killing seven and wounding ten OMON men.

The minister told TASS that "this information is false". He said that three OMON men were killed by Armenian extremists during checking passports in Geranboi district. The number of the Armenian side's losses runs into "hundreds" but Armenian leaders keep this information secret, Asadov said.